

Congress upon the statue of Sequoyah; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 651) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the proposed raise in prices of farming implements by the International Harvester Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging an appropriation for aid in the construction of public roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, indorsing the Jones bill providing for the establishment of so-called central time in the western part of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, favoring the reduction in the supply of water in Lake Andes, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, favoring a reduction of the Army and Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, asking for the continuation of Federal aid to highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring emergency tariff legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring adjusted compensation for ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring Federal aid for building roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging immediate legislation extending time of payment on entries in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation in North and South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 15878) granting a pension to Priscilla J. Raisbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 15879) granting an increase of pension to Seph J. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 15880) granting a pension to Edgar F. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15881) granting an annuity to Henry M. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15882) granting an annuity to Thomas F. King; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15883) to authorize the President to reappoint J. P. D. Shiebler a major of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 15884) granting a pension to Belle Kirgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15885) granting a pension to Willie E. Persell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15886) granting a pension to Ora Agnes Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 15887) granting an increase of pension to Eliza F. Platt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 15888) granting a pension to Cynthia Rudler Osgood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 15889) granting a pension to Cynthia J. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 15890) granting a pension to Isa Ann Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15891) granting a pension to Charlotte Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5217. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of New England Purchasing Agents' Association, concerning the decentralization plan of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5218. Also (by request), petition of council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the extension of aid to the starving nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5219. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the deportation of Mayor O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5220. By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, recommending early return to the general system of taxation followed by the Government prior to the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5221. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 4594 (House bill 14461) as amended; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5222. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition signed by citizens of Chilton, Wis., protesting against giving away of any of the people's money loaned by our Government to other nations and asking that the payment of all interest be made by those nations promptly when due, in order to reduce the burden of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5223. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of 27 citizens of Newark, N. J., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5224. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of residents of Benzonia, Benzie County, Mich., urging enactment of so-called Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5225. Also, petition of residents of Benzonia, Benzie County, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 8063, to punish violation of the Volstead Liquor Act by United States citizens while in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5226. By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of sundry citizens of Leominster, Mass., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5227. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of New England Purchasing Agents' Association, Boston, Mass., favoring the decentralized plan of the railroads which permits each system to regulate its own conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5228. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Susquehanna Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1812, in support of emergency tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5229. Also, petition of Susquehanna Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, No. 1812, opposing passage of a bill for daylight saving; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5230. Also, petition of Ambridge Board of Trade, of Ambridge, Pa., indorsing the American Legion program with respect to renewed help and assistance for disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5231. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Indiana Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, concerning the reapportionment of representation in the Southern States; to the Committee on Rules.

5232. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of women residents of Newton, Bucks County, Pa., favoring appropriations to enforce prohibition and for educational purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5233. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of H. L. Reads, State fire marshal of North Dakota, urging the passage of House bill 15327, making an appropriation for the prevention of forest fires; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5234. Also, petition of 77 citizens of New Salem, N. Dak., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we recognize the hand that leads us and the blessings which are vouchsafed to us as from Thee. Grant us Thy care this day and all days. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, January 18, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FINAL ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certificates of the governors of Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, and Oklahoma

of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President in their respective States at the election November 2, 1920, which were ordered to lie on the table.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1920, containing the actual figures for the year to be substituted for the report submitted on January 14, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEASE OF DOCKS, PIERS, WAREHOUSES, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to Senate resolution 409, submitted by Mr. JONES of Washington, December 23, 1920, information as to what steps are being taken to lease any docks, piers, warehouses, or other facilities, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

T. A. GILLESPIE LOADING CO. (S. DOC. NO. 363).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$285,141.41, required to pay amounts found due on claims for damages to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosion and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J., October 4, 5, and 6, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF EMPLOYEE IN ASSISTANT TREASURER'S OFFICE, CHICAGO (S. DOC. NO. 362).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$315.44 required by the Treasury Department for the relief of John M. Rogers, an employee in the office of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Chicago, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WEEKLY ISSUE OF PATENTS (S. DOC. NO. 361).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$75,000 required by the Patent Office for printing the weekly issue of patents, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NATIONAL PARK COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 360).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$8,000 required by the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Park Commission for the restoration of "Bond Bridge" in the park, fiscal year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers devoid of historic interest accumulated in the files of the Department of Commerce, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed the Secretary of the Senate to notify the House of Representatives thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers devoid of historic interest accumulated in the files of the Department of the Treasury, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr.

FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed the Secretary of the Senate to notify the House of Representatives thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, samples of "Industrial file" containing 10,000,000 cards which are now useless and devoid of historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and directed the Secretary of the Senate to notify the House of Representatives thereof.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of Georgia, certifying to the election of THOMAS E. WATSON as a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
Executive Department, Atlanta.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, 1920, THOMAS E. WATSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Atlanta this the 5th day of January, 1921.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

HUGH M. DORSEY, Governor.

S. G. MCLENDON,
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Northwest Mushroom Growers' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring a tariff upon mushrooms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Hart & Murphy, of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against an increase in the tariff duty on wrapper tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, favoring an appropriation to continue Federal aid to the several States in the construction of roads, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate money in aid of the construction of public roads.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has given great impetus to road building in the State of Minnesota and aided materially in financing the construction of State roads through the appropriation of Federal aid for that purpose; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota is depending upon the continuation of such Federal aid to assist it in carrying out its road-building program, and which program must be formulated and provided for by acts of the legislature of this State at its present session: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, requested to continue the Federal road aid to the several States, and that the amount of such Federal road aid for the next four years be in the amount of \$100,000,000 per year, to be apportioned and expended in accordance with the provisions of the present Federal road aid act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

LOUIS L. COLLINS,
Lieutenant Governor.

W. I. NOLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 14th day of January, 1921.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house the 14th day of January, 1921.

OSCAR ARNESON,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Approved January 18, 1921.

J. A. O. PREUS,
Governor.

Filed January 19, 1921.

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office January 19, 1921.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a resolution of Belle Point Lodge, No. 520, International Association of Machinists, of Fort Smith, Ark., opposing a reduction of the mechanical force of the Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and other railroad corporations, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of George T. Carnall et al., of Fort Smith, Ark., praying for the repeal of the tax on real-estate mortgages, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Harry E. Kelley, president of Kelley Trust Co., of Fort Smith, Ark., praying that an increased appropriation be made for the destruction of predatory animals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota. I ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The concurrent resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
State of North Dakota.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the following resolution was adopted by the seventeenth legislative assembly on the 17th day of January, 1921:

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 18th day of January, 1921.
THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas crops in the vicinity of and on the Standing Rock Reservation, located in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota, have been practical failures during the past three years; and

Whereas, under and pursuant to the proclamation of the President of the United States, under date of March 13, 1915, approximately 2,500 settlers made entries upon the lands of said Standing Rock Reservation and have settled and made homes thereupon; and

Whereas, on account of aforesaid crop failures and losses sustained in stock raising, practically all of said entrymen are in default in their payments to the Government of the United States on account of said entries; and

Whereas no provision is made for the extension of time for the payment of said installments upon said entries in meritorious cases under the provisions of the act of Congress of February 14, 1913, as is disclosed by the Department of the Interior Circular No. 680; and

Whereas, under and by virtue of a ruling of the Department of the Interior as disclosed by said Department of the Interior Circular No. 680, registers and receivers of the Federal land offices located at Bismarck, N. Dak., and Lemmon, S. Dak., have been instructed as follows:

"You are directed, therefore, in all cases where payments are now due and unpaid, and where payments hereafter become due and are not paid, to serve notice on the entrymen, of the defaults, and that in the event of their failure to make the payments in the time allowed by you for that purpose, you will report their entries to this office for cancellation.

"You will allow a period of 60 days from receipt of notice for the payment of sums now due and unpaid; but in all cases where payments hereafter become due and are not paid, you will require the payments to be made within a period of 30 days from receipt of notice."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota assembled in regular session, That by virtue of the foregoing facts and circumstances great hardships and misfortunes will be and are being endured and suffered by such entrymen to the great detriment of the States of North and South Dakota, and the citizens thereof;

Therefore we respectfully urge the National Congress in session assembled to immediately consider and relieve this most deplorable condition by proper legislation; be it

Resolved further, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be requested to forward copies of this concurrent resolution immediately upon its passage and approval to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the National House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., and to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the National Congress from the States of North and South Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, bills covering the same subject were introduced some time ago, one in the House and the other by myself in the Senate, providing for the extension referred to. Both bills are pending before the Committee on Public Lands of the respective Houses. It is my information that there will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate to-morrow and that the bill will be ordered reported. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], of course, understands the necessity for prompt action in the matter if we are to have the relief.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the Committee on Public Lands will meet to-morrow morning at 10:30, and I shall call the matter to the attention of the committee at that time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope that the Senator can get a report and immediate action on it. It is very important.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill has been referred to the department for a report. I can not state whether the report is before the committee, but I shall endeavor to ascertain to-day, and if not I shall ask for the report at once.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say that the report is before the committee, because I have a copy of it myself, and the original I sent to the committee.

Mr. McNARY presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relating to the Fordney emergency tariff bill, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 1 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 18th day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZIER,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1.

Whereas this country is being flooded with foreign products which are destroying the home markets for the produce from the American farm, thereby causing financial disaster to overtake our farmers and stock raisers, and in this way destroy the very foundation of American prosperity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to pass at the earliest possible moment the Fordney emergency tariff bill; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby further memorialized to enact a comprehensive tariff bill protecting American labor, American products, and American industry; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit by telegraph one copy of this resolution to each Senator and Representative in Congress from Oregon.

Adopted by the senate January 10, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 13, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 1. Introduced by Senator Dennis. John P. Hunt, chief clerk. Filed January 17, 1921. Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state.

Mr. McNARY presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 18th day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZIER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 2.

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas it has come to the attention of this body that there is before the Congress of the United States a measure known as the Fordney or fourfold adjustment compensation plan for ex-service men submitted by the American Legion; and

Whereas the purpose of this measure is to equalize the sacrifice of the American people in the World War so that the men who served in our Armies, Navy, and Marine Corps, and who were required to leave their home and employment in defense of the country, may be assisted in readjusting themselves to the economic and industrial life of the country; and

Whereas a decision by Congress has been delayed for nearly two years, creating a situation wherein the people of many States recognizing the validity, justice, and urgency of such compensation have been moved in their impatience at the failure of Congress to act to take upon themselves the partial payment of this obligation; and

Whereas this obligation is essentially and fundamentally a Federal obligation and which is long overdue; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States have passed favorably upon this measure:

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, do respectfully and earnestly petition the Congress of the United States forthwith to act in concurrence with the House of Representatives to the end that this just claim of the men who served in the World War may be liquidated without further delay.

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this joint memorial under his certificate and seal to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oregon in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate January 12, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 12, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 2. Introduced by Korell, Johnson, Hammond, Pierce, North, Wells, Marsh, and Leonard. W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed January 17, 1921. Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state.

Mr. McNARY presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the Record:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of the house joint memorial No. 3 with the original thereof adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 18th day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 3.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States of America:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in regular session convened, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the American Association of Highway Officials, in convention assembled at Louisville, Ky., in December, 1919, adopted a series of resolutions, copies of which were transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, in which resolutions there were, among other matters urged upon the attention and consideration of the Congress of the United States, the following facts:

That the States within whose boundaries are included large national forest reserves have expended during the last five years millions of dollars in the improvement of State and county highway systems; that the majority of these States have issued bonds in large amounts in order to finance modern highway construction; that there are within the boundaries of these States approximately 150,000,000 acres of national forest reserves; that State and county highways of national importance traverse these reservations through areas involving the most difficult highway construction in the West; that the forests in these various States are great national assets which should be preserved, and the construction of roads and highways traversing the said forests facilitates the control of forest fires, which have, in the past, caused tremendous losses; that the appropriations heretofore made by Congress have been inadequate to permit of sufficient road construction within such national forests to keep pace with State and county highway systems and construction, or to provide for a standard of construction equaling that of the several States and counties; that the withdrawal of large areas by the Government has decreased the taxable resources of the States and counties wherein such withdrawals have been made, thereby reducing the bonding capacity of said States and counties; that it is the duty of the National Government to provide sufficient funds to develop its national resources to the same extent and standards as that of the States and counties similarly situated; and

Whereas the facts and conditions heretofore stated apply with equal force, as emphasized by the American Association of Highway Officials, to Indian and other Federal reservations, and to unappropriated lands of the United States; and

Whereas the said Association of Highway Officials did, by said resolutions, urge upon the United States Congress, the appropriation of the sum of \$100,000,000 per year for a series of years, for the construction of rural post roads in the several States; and

Whereas the Public Land States Highway Association, in regular session convened in Washington, D. C., in February, 1920, unanimously indorsed the principles involved in the Louisville resolution; and

Whereas as a result of said conferences the Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, United States Senator from the State of Oregon, introduced a bill for the continuation of the Federal aid for the construction of rural post roads, and for the construction of roads and trails, within and partially within the forest reserves; and

Whereas at a subsequent annual meeting of the American Association of Highway Officials, in convention assembled in Washington, D. C., in December, 1920, said Association of Highway Officials, 47 States of the Union being represented, unanimously indorsed the principles involved in said bill introduced by Senator CHAMBERLAIN; and as a result of said convention, and the recommendations of said American Association of Highway Officials, the Hon. C. N. McARTHUR, of Oregon, introduced in the House of Representatives a bill embodying in substance that contained in the Chamberlain bill; and

Whereas said American Association of Highway Officials, after full consideration of the McArthur bill, unanimously indorsed the same; and

Whereas said legislation is now pending before the two branches of Congress; and

Whereas your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, unanimously indorse the Chamberlain-McArthur bill, and in support thereof respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the further fact that the State of Oregon occupies a peculiar and special position, with reference to national forests and other national and Federal reserves, and therefore is in a peculiar and special need of adequate highway construction; and

Whereas the State of Oregon has expended during the past four years over \$27,000,000 in the construction of a permanent highway system in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the State of Oregon has expended its full quota of Federal aid funds allotted to Oregon, and unless further extension of Federal aid in the construction of rural post roads, and the construction of forest roads and trails, is granted by this Congress, a serious breach in the highway program of the State of Oregon must necessarily follow: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in regular session convened, That we do hereby most respectfully urge and request that the Congress of the United States of America give special and immediate attention to the passage of the

Chamberlain-McArthur bill, and appropriate for highway construction the amounts designated in said bill, both for the construction of rural post roads in the several States and for the construction of forest roads and trails in the public land States, as designated in said bill, or so much thereof as can be justly and rightly appropriated this session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the seal of his office, to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress and to the presiding officer of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Roads and Highways of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the United States Senate.

Adopted by the senate January 12, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house January 12, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 3. Introduced by Mr. Bean; W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed January 17, 1921. Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state.

Mr. SHEPPARD (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) presented three concurrent resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, which took the same course as the identical concurrent resolutions appearing above presented by Mr. McNARY.

Mr. WARREN presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Wyoming in relation to the so-called packers' bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Wyoming, ss:

I, W. E. Chaplin, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed copy of original house joint memorial No. 2, of the Sixteenth State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original on file in this office and that the same is a full, true, and correct transcript of said memorial and of the whole thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 22d day of January, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

W. E. CHAPLIN,
Secretary of State.

By H. M. LYMAN,
Deputy.

House joint memorial 2.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be memorialized as follows:

Whereas on January 24, 1921, 4 p. m., the Senate of the National Congress will by special order vote on the Gronna bill, which provides for the control of the packing and meat-producing industry through a live-stock commission clothed with power to make rules and regulations, said commission to be appointed by Federal Government: And therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully urge your honorable body that you give the said Gronna bill the most serious consideration, as it may relate to all of those industries which are directly affected by legislation which is aimed at the packing industry at a time when our business conditions are in a state of unparalleled disturbance and distress; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to each of the Members of the Wyoming delegation in our National Congress and to the chairmen of the Senate and House committees which have this bill under consideration.

FRANK E. LUCAS,
Vice President of the Senate.
L. R. EWART,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. KENDRICK presented an identical concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Wyoming, which took the same course as the resolution appearing above.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Sheridan Woman's Club, of Sheridan, Wyo., remonstrating against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LENROOT presented a petition of Women of the War Veterans of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of a bonus bill for ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the State Grange, of Maine, opposing a daylight saving law or a zone composed of certain Eastern States, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maine State Grange, of Auburn, Me., favoring an embargo on all foreign shipments of potatoes for a period of one year, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Richmond, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation restricting the immigration of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the board of directors of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Wasco Farm Center, of Wasco, Calif., favoring legislation to prohibit gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Farmers' Union No. 225, of Bache, Okla., protesting against speculation in farm products, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Kansas-Oklahoma Fruit Jobbers' Association, of Wichita, Kans., favoring a duty on potatoes, onions, and lemons to be included in the emergency tariff bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the message of the President of May 25, 1920, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of State, regarding certain property in London as a residence for the American ambassador, etc., reported a bill (S. 4916) to acquire land and buildings in London, England, for the use of the diplomatic representative of the United States, which was read twice by its title, and submitted a report (No. 716) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4666) to amend section 13 of an act known as the Federal reserve act, approved December 23, 1913, reported it favorably with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 717) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4897) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended, reported it favorably without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4719) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear and determine the claim of the owners of the Danish steamship *Flynderborg* against the United States, and for other purposes, reported it favorably with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 718) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1949) for the relief of George F. Reid, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 719) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13319) for the relief of Wilson Certain, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 720) thereon.

Mr. LENROOT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of George LeClear, reported it favorably without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis, reported it favorably without amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 721) thereon.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF MISSOURI.

Mr. McLEAN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 4893) to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think I have any objection to the consideration of the bill, but such bills should first be read, and then we can determine the question.

Mr. BORAH. If there is going to be any discussion of the bill, I shall object. We have not had morning business for about 10 days, and we ought to get through with that. Does the Senator think there will be any discussion?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not think there will be any opposition to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union there shall be coined at the mints of the United States 50-cent pieces to the number of 250,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

Sec. 2. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4909) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government for the detention of three subjects of Norway in Hudson County, N. J.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 4910) to provide for the advertising for bids on purchases of supplies and contracts for labor and materials for the construction and repair of vessels under the United States Shipping Board or the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation; and

A bill (S. 4911) authorizing and directing examination and survey of the Hudson River channel along the Weehawken-Edgewater water front; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4912) to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4913) to provide that engineer field clerks shall have the same military status and be subject to the same obligations and benefits as Army field clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico:

A bill (S. 4914) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 4915) granting an increase of pension to Nellie A. Sanborn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4917) to amend the income tax law, being Title II of the revenue act of 1918, by permitting the deduction from net income subject to tax of contributions made by corporations to organizations formed for certain enumerated purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4918) granting a pension to William J. Swift; to the Committee on Pensions.

CHIEF OF MILITIA BUREAU.

Mr. CAPPER. I submit a resolution calling upon the Secretary of War for certain information in regard to the appointment of the Chief of the Militia Bureau, and I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the resolution be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 432) was read, as follows:

Whereas section 81 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled, 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920, provides that, "The Chief of the Militia Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of present and former National Guard officers, recommended by the governors of the several States and Territories as suitable for such appointment"; and Whereas in compliance with the provisions of this act the governors of 35 States recommended to the War Department the appointment of Charles I. Martin, Adjutant General of the State of Kansas, president of the Adjutant Generals' Association of the United States, and a veteran of the War with Spain and the World War, as Chief of the Militia Bureau; and

Whereas it is believed by a large number of National Guard organizations that the appointment of a Chief of the Militia Bureau made on December 29, 1920, ignores the recommendations of the governors of 35 of the 48 States duly filed with the War Department in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress, and is contrary to the spirit and purpose of Congress in enacting a law providing for such appointment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, as to the number, nature, and source of the recommendations filed in behalf of each officer considered in connection with the appointment of a Chief of the Militia Bureau, and present to the Senate all other information in the possession of the department having a bearing on this appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the resolution if the Senator from Kansas desires it to be passed in the form in which he has presented it, but I desire to call attention to the fact that it calls on the Secretary of War for his reasons in making the appointment therein referred to. I doubt whether it is in line with a resolution of inquiry to call on the Secretary of War for his reasons in making a certain appointment. The Senator from Kansas is entitled to call on a department chief for facts and statements, but calling for his reasons for an appointment I think would give him good ground to decline to respond to the resolution. We have no right to demand a Cabinet officer's reasons for his action. I shall not object to the Senator's resolution, but I doubt whether it is in proper form.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have no objection to eliminating that part of the resolution, if the Senator from Alabama prefers that I shall do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should prefer to have that part of the resolution stricken out. I think the Senator, however, is entitled to the facts for which his resolution asks.

Mr. CAPPER. That is what we want, and is really all we want.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not intend to object to the resolution, if the Senator desires it to pass as he has written it, but I would much prefer that the portion calling for the Secretary's reasons be stricken out, because, I repeat, I do not think we have any right in the Senate to call on a Cabinet officer for the reasons governing his action.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The resolution is somewhat long and contains several whereases. I think it should go over until to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

SUSPENSION OF NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM.

Mr. BORAH. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 433) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether in its opinion it is practical and also a sound policy to suspend our naval building program now in progress for the period of six months to the end that a full investigation and free discussion may be had as to what constitutes a modern fighting navy—a navy with the types of ships and with the air and submarine weapons that would be most effective in the strategy and tactics of future war on the sea; and also to the end that we may avail ourselves in the matter both as to economy and efficiency of any possible agreement between naval powers providing for the reduction of armaments.

Second. That said committee report to the Senate such data and information (not already printed and made public) as the said committee has had before it for consideration relative to the probable value of surface ships in future naval warfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho to state what is the purpose of the resolution and why he desires its immediate consideration.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the naval appropriation bill will be here shortly, I presume. I had intended to discuss the matter briefly, but I do not desire to do so in the morning hour. I will simply say that the resolution calls upon the Committee on Naval Affairs for information with reference to the feasibility and the wisdom of suspending the naval building program for six months. As the Senator perhaps knows, Great Britain has suspended her building program for six months for the purpose of ascertaining, if she may, the real revelations in the war with reference to what constitutes a modern navy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, I realize the importance of the question. It is a problem that not only confronts this country but confronts all the world as to whether present plans for naval armaments shall be proceeded with. The Senator has directed his resolution of inquiry to a committee of the Senate. Of course, all of us have great respect for their conclusions,

where they have been deliberately worked out; but I do not know whether or not the Senator is informed if the committee to which the resolution is directed has developed such a study of the situation that they are prepared to make a report based on the facts and upon the consideration which they have given to the subject.

Mr. BORAH. What I desire to ascertain is whether or not the Committee on Naval Affairs has considered the question, and if so, what information it has in order that it may be laid before the Senate. If the report is satisfactory, I intend to follow this by a resolution directing an investigation of the entire question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, speaking for myself and as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, I hope the resolution will be adopted. I think the Naval Affairs Committee within a reasonably short time and during its consideration of the naval appropriation bill may obtain the information which, as I heard it read, the resolution calls for. It seems to me that now is an appropriate time for this Government to indicate to the world its purpose not to continue the burdens of military and naval armament. I hope that the Naval Affairs Committee, if this resolution shall be adopted, will make an adequate investigation to determine whether or not we may not suspend the naval program for the period indicated in the resolution, with a view ultimately to relieving the American people from the tremendous burden which is now bearing upon them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is not present, but certainly I can see no objection to the adoption of the resolution of inquiry. It will require considerable time to make the proper investigation and present a satisfactory report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

SUPPLY OF COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It calls for a report from the Department of Agriculture on the subject of fertilizers. We are having a great many complaints about the high cost of commercial fertilizers. The department made a report in 1916, in response to a resolution offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. That report is very instructive and valuable. In it the department stated that they were carrying on certain experiments and investigations in certain bureaus looking to a reduction in the cost of the elements entering into commercial fertilizer. The resolution introduced by me would bring that report down to date. I think it very important that we have the information.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 435) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain as nearly as possible, and to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, the following: The amount of commercial potash, nitrogen, and phosphoric acid available for fertilizer purposes, and the price of each of these articles as compared with the prices for 1913; and to furnish any suggestions as to relieving the situation in case the amount of any or all of these is insufficient or the price prohibitive, and to report what investigations were made and with what results, mentioned in Senate Document 262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that resolution ought to go over until to-morrow. It is rather broad in its scope, as I understand the language from hearing it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I am inclined to think that a somewhat similar resolution, offered the other day, was misunderstood to some extent. The chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads made a motion to have it referred to that committee, I think with the idea that it called for a report from that committee on the nominations, and that it asked for the names of service men and ex-service men and widows of ex-service men. It did not ask for that. It simply called for information; that information to be furnished to the Senate and then subsequently disposed of by the Senate. This resolution relieves the committee entirely of that work and directs the information to be furnished to the Senate by the Postmaster General.

I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Let us have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 434) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the names of all former service men, and the widows of such, recommended by him to the President for appointment as postmasters and by the President submitted to the Senate for confirmation and not as yet acted upon.

Mr. LODGE. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I think the resolution had better go over. A resolution dealing with the same subject matter was objected to heretofore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

CHANGES IN CUSTOMS SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 359).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to continue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor.

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state that the following changes in the organization of the Customs Service have been made by Executive order:

By Executive order dated February 2, 1920, customs collection district No. 27 (southern California) was abolished and customs collection districts Nos. 25 (San Diego) and 27 (Los Angeles) were created.

By Executive order dated February 27, 1920, the county of Alexandria, Va., including the port of Alexandria, was transferred from customs collection district No. 13 (Maryland) to customs collection district No. 14 (Virginia).

By Executive order dated March 6, 1920, the port of Cedar Keys, customs collection district No. 18 (Florida) was abolished.

By Executive order dated September 1, 1920, the port of Sulzer, customs collection district No. 31 (Alaska), was abolished and a port of entry was created at Craig in the same collection district.

All of the above changes were dictated by considerations of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes with the enforcement of which the customs service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
25 January, 1921.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.). The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4554, to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission," and so forth.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, we should have the calendar considered. It is the experience of the Senate that we ought to have one day a week when we can consider bills as they are reached on the calendar. I object, and call for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4554.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion of the Senator from Washington is not in order, the bill not having been reached on the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I did not know that it had been arranged that to-day should take the place of Monday. I did not understand that, or I would not have made the motion; so I withdraw it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed, by unanimous consent, that to-day was to take the place of Calendar Monday.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was not aware of that, or I should not have made the request at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we begin at Order of Business 504. That is the place where the

Senate discontinued the consideration of the calendar on the last calendar day.

Mr. ASHURST. That is fair.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether in the event of the completion of the calendar from that number before the expiration of the morning hour recurrence can be had to the first part of the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to the request of my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the call of the calendar will begin with Order of Business 504.

The bill (S. 3318) for the relief of Willis B. Cross was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 515) to correct the military record of Charles K. Bond, alias Kimball W. Rollins, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 8038) to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McLEAN. I think that had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4076) to amend section 4404 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act approved July 2, 1918, providing that the supervising inspectors of the Steamboat-Inspection Service be included under the classified civil service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I should like an explanation of that bill. I reserve the right to object to its consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know whether the senior Senator from Utah objects to the consideration of that bill at this time or not.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; I object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator objects. I knew that he had objected before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2903) to provide that robbery of a Federal reserve bank or member bank shall constitute a felony, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 12266) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That bill can not be considered under the five-minute rule, and I therefore ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

W. T. DINGLER.

The bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of W. T. Dingler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay \$60.63 to W. T. Dingler, the amount paid by him as bondsman for postmistress at Zebulon, Ark., to cover loss occasioned by the destroying of the post office by cyclone April 29, 1909.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. V. HINKLE.

The bill (H. R. 4184) for the relief of C. V. Hinkle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to C. V. Hinkle, late clerk in post office, Conway, Ark., \$1,308.33 for salary for 29 months at the rate of \$1,000 per annum, the period during which he was dismissed from duty as said post-office clerk, upon charges preferred, which charges were found untrue, and by Executive order he was reinstated, it being found that the real culprit was not said Hinkle, but another person, who is now serving a Federal penitentiary term.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OSCAR SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Oscar Smith was announced as next in order.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall be glad to hear the report of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], who has this bill in charge, as to whether there is any liability upon the part of the Government to make payment for the amount named in the bill.

Mr. SPENCER. The department were of the opinion that there was. The service was rendered, and the committee were of the opinion that the man was entitled to his compensation.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if there was an obligation upon the part of the Government and the man rendered services, whether there is not some authority now by which the department could make compensation?

Mr. SPENCER. The committee found no such authority. The passage of this bill by the House was the reason for its approval by the Committee on Claims. There is quite an elaborate report on the bill, which I shall be glad to read to the Senator. It sets out the facts in the case somewhat at length, and the opinions of the departments are in it as well.

Mr. KING. I shall not ask the Senator to take the time of the Senate for that purpose. If the Senator can recall the facts and upon his recollection of them is of the opinion that this is a valid claim against the Government, I shall not object. If, upon the contrary, there is doubt in the Senator's mind with regard to that matter, I shall object to its consideration.

Mr. SPENCER. I can not say to the Senator that the facts in the case, which are somewhat extensive, are clear in my own mind.

Mr. KING. Then I ask that the bill go over, and I shall be glad to examine the report between now and the next calendar Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 1789) for the relief of Thomas P. Darr was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1313) for the relief of Francis Nicholson was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EXPORTATION OF SUGAR.

The bill (S. 4420) to prohibit the exportation of sugar, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] introduced and reported this bill. The last time the calendar was under consideration I made the statement that the bill ought to be indefinitely postponed, but that I would not make the motion until I had spoken to the Senator. Since that time I have called the Senator's attention to the bill, and he agrees that it shall be indefinitely postponed. Therefore I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

INTERFERENCE WITH COMMERCE.

The bill (S. 4204) to prohibit interference with commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is greatly interested in this bill, is not here and wanted to be here when it was considered. I therefore ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AWARD OF DECORATIONS.

The bill (S. 4432) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of some member of the Military Affairs Committee what is the reason of the provision found in the last lines of section 2, which reads as follows:

That honorable separation from the service of the United States of persons who would otherwise be entitled to receive them shall not prohibit or preclude the issuance to such persons of such decorations.

I would like to inquire whether or not the existing law prohibits the reception of such honors by persons who are not within the service and who would be entitled to such insignia, decorations, and so forth, if they were within the service; and if there is an existing law which prohibits it, is it the intention to repeal that law by this enactment? It would seem to me that if there is a law prohibiting the devices, decorations, and emblems from being distributed to those who have been separated from the service, there must have been some reason for such a statute, and if this is intended to repeal that statute, there ought to be some reasons assigned for such action. I should be very glad if some member of the Military Affairs Committee would offer some explanation in regard to that matter. I dislike very much to object to this bill, because I

am in entire sympathy with it, if I understand its terms; yet I do not quite understand why such a provision of law is necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. I object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM H. H. HART.

The bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, to establish Hart University, and to provide for its maintenance and support, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 377) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I ask the Senator from Utah a question? This resolution and the bill just passed over refer to the same matter?

Mr. SMOOT. They refer to the same matter, but I think that as this claim of Prof. Hart has been here so long it ought to go to the Court of Claims, so that court can decide as to whether he has any actual claim against the Government or not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It occurred to me that as both refer to the same matter, one or the other of them ought to be indefinitely postponed and taken off the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be done. The bill will be indefinitely postponed if the claim is referred to the Court of Claims. That is all there is to it. If the resolution is agreed to, I shall move immediately for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 2665.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the consideration of Senate resolution 377?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let it be reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 377) reported by Mr. SPENCER from the Committee on Claims, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Before the resolution is disposed of, I would like to ask the Senator from Utah on what terms the claim is to go to the Court of Claims. Is the court to find a judgment, ascertain the facts, or what?

Mr. SMOOT. Under the resolution the court will ascertain the facts in the case. There is no requirement for a judgment, and Congress will have to make an appropriation to cover whatever the court may decide is due Prof. Hart. This is to determine the facts in the case.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the action of the Senate adopting the resolution dispose of Senate bill 2665?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I have just stated that I would immediately move for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 2665 if the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, or the chairman, or some other member of the committee, whether the committee are satisfied that this is a valid claim?

Mr. SMOOT. I think there is an amount really due Prof. Hart. I would like to have the Court of Claims ascertain the amount. I do not know whether the Senator has ever read the long hearings which have been held before the Appropriations Committees for several years in regard to the burning of Prof. Hart's school; but I have gone through the testimony carefully, and I have concluded, as I think any other Senator will who will read it, that Prof. Hart has a valid claim, and I just want it to go to the Court of Claims that the court may ascertain the amount.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, to establish Hart University, and to provide for its maintenance and support, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPERINTENDENT OF WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND MARKETS.

The bill (H. R. 8067) to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of the

District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BOULEVARD ON MISSIONARY RIDGE.

The bill (H. R. 12502) providing for a report on the cost of improving and maintaining the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report accompanying the bill, and I would like to have the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] give an explanation of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a full explanation given in the bill itself. It states the facts concerning this road.

Mr. SMOOT. Then let it be read.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will permit it to be read, because that is the best way to get a statement of the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of improvement and maintaining in proper condition for travel the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, from the north end of said road, near East Chattanooga, in Hamilton County, Tenn., to Rossville, in Walker County, Ga. (a distance of 7 or 8 miles), the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause an examination of said road to be made, and a report to be made by the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park Commission of the approximate cost of such improvement and the manner in which it can be and should be done. The said commission shall report estimates of the cost of said improvement by concrete surface, and other proper methods. The cost of concrete surface, gutters, excavations, and fills wherever necessary shall be reported, and the cost of graveling excavations and fills, if that method shall be deemed best; and the maintenance of such road, per annum, by oiling and other means, shall also be reported.

No material change shall be made in the line of the road as now established, nor shall the cost of any excavations or fills be considered except where it may be absolutely necessary for a first-class boulevard; but estimates for the cost of widening the road wherever it shall be necessary shall be made.

It shall also report what the cost of concreting the road in its present condition, without additional fills or excavations, will be; and the cost of graveling and maintenance per annum would be, including oiling and the difference between the cost and maintenance of a concrete road per annum and the gravelled and oiled road.

The commission shall report to the Secretary of War, as herein provided, within four months from the passage of this act, and the Secretary of War shall transmit this report to Congress with his recommendations in the premises.

The cost of such examination and report shall not exceed \$1,000, and so much of said sum as is necessary to make such examination and report is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. SMOOT. Why does the Senator ask for an appropriation to carry out this work? Can it not be done under the general appropriations which are made?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand not. It is a House bill, and I understand that it will require a small appropriation to carry out what is provided in the bill. If the Senator feels that the amount provided is too much and wants it made \$500, I should think the work could be done for \$500.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me that \$500 would be ample.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only trouble about it is that it is now so late in the session that if we amended the bill it would be difficult to have it become a law. I hope the Senator will let it pass without amendment, because it is a matter which ought to be attended to, and it ought to be attended to at once.

Mr. SMOOT. Is this survey and examination to be made upon Government-owned lands entirely?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that the road is largely through the park and goes out a short distance to the fort. The Government owns and controls it. It is Government property.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government owns the whole of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. It owns the whole of it, I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$500."

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not offer that amendment, because it will be difficult to get the bill through at this session unless we agree to it as it is.

Mr. SMOOT. There will be plenty of time for a conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, strike out "\$1,000" and in lieu insert "\$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4357) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, Army and Navy nurses (male and female), and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 380) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2673) for the relief of James L. Vai was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3483) for the relief of George T. Hamilton was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

The bill (S. 4057) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to remove the charge of desertion under certain conditions from the records of former members of the naval service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4322) for the relief of Philip A. Hertz was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATES OF I. G. WICKERSHAM AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 4501) for the relief of certain estates was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the personal or legal representative of the estate of I. G. Wickersham, late of California, the sum of \$4,884.51; to the estate of George W. Clayton, late of Colorado, the sum of \$710.01; to the estate of Samuel H. Galpin, the sum of \$187.31; to the estate of William I. Townsend, the sum of \$3,780.27—all late of Connecticut; to the estate of Amanda S. Cook, the sum of \$997.95; to the estate of Everett E. Dutton, the sum of \$222.66; to the estate of George W. Hoffman, the sum of \$1,096.20; to the estate of Theodore Lattin, the sum of \$205.90; to the estate of Abner M. Lewis, the sum of \$303.30; to the estate of Aaron H. McClurg, the sum of \$142.50; to the estate of William J. McDowell, the sum of \$92.96; to the estate of Francis E. Rigby, the sum of \$715.14; to the estate of William H. Salisbury, the sum of \$350.43; to the estate of Francis T. Wheeler, the sum of \$5,427.34—all late of Illinois; to the estate of Helen P. Carson, the sum of \$166.73; to the estate of Elizabeth Campbell, the sum of \$365.62—all late of Indiana; to the estate of Booth F. Glover, the sum of \$557.19; to the estate of U. Marinoni, the sum of \$1,011.71—all late of Louisiana; to the estate of Mary C. Carson, the sum of \$142.06; to the estate of Henry W. Kingsbury, the sum of \$300.88; to the estate of William Renshaw, the sum of \$353.52—all late of Maryland; to the estate of Clara A. H. Adams, the sum of \$238.37; to the estate of Charles W. S. Adams, the sum of \$184.31; to the estate of John K. P. Balch, the sum of \$413.13; to the estate of Robert Bartlett, the sum of \$110.57; to the estate of Julia A. Beal, the sum of \$148.50; to the estate of Lyman Brooks, the sum of \$118.56; to the estate of John W. Corey, the sum of \$181.82; to the estate of Harriet B. Chapman, the sum of \$385.40; to the estate of Susan Emily Cunningham, the sum of \$382.54; to the estate of Nancy M. Downer, the sum of \$3,811.74; to the estate of William G. Doe, the sum of \$646.65; to the estate of Chauncey G. Fuller, the sum of \$208.40; to the estate of Mary E. Fletcher, the sum of \$118.74; to the estate of Elizabeth J. Greeley, the sum of \$118.20; to the estate of Pauline Gerry, the sum of \$943.53; to the estate of Mary H. Grosvenor, the sum of \$163.42; to the estate of Frederick A. Gilbert, the sum of \$355.26; to the estate of David N. Holway, the sum of \$132.68; to the estate of Elizabeth F. Harvey, the sum of \$1,011.90; to the estate of Susan B. Lyman, the sum of \$2,578.96; to the estate of Elizabeth P. Loring, the sum of \$1,895.55; to the estate of Mary S. Moore, the sum of \$77.34; to the estate of Esther S. B. Pettie, the sum of \$185.81; to the estate of Eliza A. Paine, the sum of \$1,247.61; to the estate of Charles H. Pinkham, the sum of \$1,014.66; to the estate of George A. Sammet, the sum of \$374.30; to the estate of George Shorey, the sum of \$583.58; to the estate of Mary E. Stearns, the sum of \$891.14; to the estate of Adeline G. Seccomb, the sum of \$128.60; to the estate of Cecelia Tully, the sum of \$114.01; to the estate of Gilman J. Wright, the sum of \$159.75; to the estate of Francis W. Wright, the sum of \$189.94; to the estate of Francis W. Wood, the sum of \$306.24; to the estate of Mary Davis Denny, the sum of \$118.53; to the estate of James F. Stevens, the sum of \$273.40—all late of Massachusetts; to the estate of Jay A. Hubbell, the sum of \$1,236.44, late of Michigan; to the estate of Eliza C. Gardner, the sum of \$633.42; to the estate of Frederick Heman, the sum of \$334.18; to the estate of William Koken, the sum of \$900.01; to the estate of Thomas M. Page, the sum of \$1,894.80; to the estate of Charles E. Pearce, the sum of \$2,994.94; to the estate of Eliza R. Paschall, the sum of \$836.36; to the estate of Thomas Rankin, Jr., the sum of \$716.65; to the estate of William Senter, the sum of \$1,689.21; to the estate of Edward Walsh, the sum of \$1,100.99; to the estate of Catherine D. Wainwright, the sum of \$15,176.80—all late of Missouri; to the estate of John E. Caffrey, the sum of \$426.36; to the estate of Peter C. Diehl, the sum of \$667.47; to the estate of Hope Z. Deacon, the sum of \$798.58; to the estate of Walter Ferrier, the sum of \$437.12; to the estate of Garret A. Hooper, the sum of \$558.64; to the estate of Frederic Wood, the sum of \$924—all late of New Jersey; to the estate of Serena P. Appleton, the sum of \$387.15; to the estate of William H. Appleton, the sum of \$2,589.34; to the estate of Theodore M. Barnes, the sum of \$303.88; to the estate of Alice A. Bacon, the sum of \$133.19; to the estate of Sophia E. Beach, the sum of \$645.88; to the estate of Catharine Bolken, the sum of \$113.29; to the estate of Thomas H. Barowsky, the sum of \$845.69; to the estate of Frank A. Burnham, the sum of \$91.62; to the estate of Alex. Gordon Bradley, the sum of \$509.83; to the estate of Julius P. Child, the sum of \$172.02; to the estate of James A. Christie, the sum

of \$564; to the estate of Lucretia G. Clowes, the sum of \$4,249.35; to the estate of James Devlin, the sum of \$179.63; to the estate of Miln N. Dayton, the sum of \$242.23; to the estate of Cornelia B. De Peyster, the sum of \$172.41; to the estate of William G. Evans, the sum of \$465.06; to the estate of Benjamin T. Frothingham, the sum of \$3,338.92; to the estate of Virginia D. Furman, the sum of \$515.22; to the estate of Thomas Fenton, the sum of \$997.75; to the estate of Thomas Gould, the sum of \$695.12; to the estate of William H. Gelschen, the sum of \$2,325.57; to the estate of Margaret Hilliard, the sum of \$598.56; to the estate of Mary Ann Hayes, the sum of \$605.22; to the estate of Pierre Humbert, the sum of \$2,815.08; to the estate of Emma F. Hall, the sum of \$234.96; to the estate of Mary Hanstein, the sum of \$171.42; to the estate of Philip J. Holzderber, the sum of \$270.36; to the estate of J. Lee Judson, the sum of \$2,681.76; to the estate of Sarah M. Knight, the sum of \$454.02; to the estate of Edward Kelly, the sum of \$1,805.94; to the estate of Mary Ann Kissam, the sum of \$668.30; to the estate of Daniel D. Lake, the sum of \$282.86; to the estate of J. Nelson Low, the sum of \$83.68; to the estate of Phoebe A. Lowerre, the sum of \$98.38; to the estate of John McCullough, the sum of \$121.72; to the estate of John McDermott, the sum of \$292.66; to the estate of Morris Mark, the sum of \$1,847.26; to the estate of John H. Moss, the sum of \$734.88; to the estate of Jane D. Marks, the sum of \$612.13; to the estate of Michael Murphy, the sum of \$2,640.90; to the estate of Courtlandt D. Moss, the sum of \$1,061.10; to the estate of Alfred Ray, the sum of \$4,508.89; to the estate of Agnes H. Robinson, the sum of \$525.68; to the estate of James Robley, the sum of \$383.84; to the estate of William M. Rice, the sum of \$2,690.27; to the estate of Mary R. Swan, the sum of \$4,204.15; to the estate of Helene Sommerhoff, the sum of \$1,022.63; to the estate of Julia Stansbury, the sum of \$584.29; to the estate of John R. Thomas, the sum of \$1,697.73; to the estate of Julia K. Thomas, the sum of \$102.03; to the estate of Sarah A. Townsend, the sum of \$1,951.12; to the estate of Sarah A. Thomson, the sum of \$331.90; to the estate of Charles Unger, the sum of \$7,655.58; to the estate of Daniel E. Wyand, the sum of \$106.02; to the estate of Sarah M. Weston, the sum of \$2,929.53; to the estate of William Sanford Weeks, the sum of \$161.12; to the estate of Nicolaus Will, the sum of \$310.36—all late of New York; to the estate of Charles Baker, the sum of \$1,118.81; to the estate of Emerine Baldwin, the sum of \$1,070; to the estate of John W. Moore, the sum of \$380.55; to the estate of James M. Smith, the sum of \$532.56—all late of Ohio; to the estate of Charles Caleb Cresson, the sum of \$1,139.45; to the estate of James S. Cox, the sum of \$959.34; to the estate of Franklin B. Eisen, the sum of \$965.58; to the estate of George W. Farr, the sum of \$527.86; to the estate of Morton P. Henry, the sum of \$1,766.15; to the estate of David Hey, the sum of \$185.98; to the estate of Griffith Morgan Hopkins, the sum of \$2,600.83; to the estate of Annie Henderson, the sum of \$172; to the estate of Susan W. Longstreth, the sum of \$105.49; to the estate of William M. Levering, the sum of \$357.96; to the estate of Josiah Miller, the sum of \$515.32; to the estate of Stephen P. M. Tasker, the sum of \$883.35; to the estate of Josephine S. White, the sum of \$282.93—all late of Pennsylvania; and to the estate of John Scowcraft, late of Utah, the sum of \$603.93, or so much thereof as may be due under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States (see *United States v. Jones*, and *McCoach v. Pratt*, reported in 236 U. S. Rep., decided in January, 1915).

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 1856) for the relief of Arthur J. Burdick was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report accompanying the bill. I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7567) for the relief of G. T. and W. B. Hastings, partners trading as Hastings Bros., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4005) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

REUBEN R. HUNTER.

The bill (S. 676) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of the bill. It is a very meritorious matter. It has been fully considered by the committee having the bill in charge, and I feel sure it would be regarded as a meritorious bill by Senators if they understood it.

Mr. KING. I will withhold objection while the Senator may make an explanation of it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The case is a simple one. In 1916 there was a forest fire in New Mexico, and Mr. Hunter, with others, volunteered to help fight that fire. In doing so he suffered such injuries that he became totally blind. The bill simply makes provision for him to come within the terms of the compensation act of 1916, the same as though he were an employee of the United States. The young man is totally blind,

totally dependent, and the bill gives him the right of a Federal employee in that respect. I hope that the bill may be passed.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether he has considered the wisdom and propriety of putting into the compensation class individuals who are not employees of the Government? Would it not be better to make a direct appropriation rather than assign to such persons a class or status which they do not enjoy?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will say to the Senator that the bill as originally prepared by me provided for a lump-sum appropriation, but the Committee on Claims, which had the matter in hand, decided that it would be better to deal with it in this way. So the bill as amended is really the bill of the Committee on Claims. They considered the matter at great length. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], and other members of the committee gave very careful consideration to the bill and suggested this manner of dealing with the matter.

I see no reason in the world why the young man should not have the status of an employee serving the Government of the United States at the time of a desperate emergency, aiding in saving a very large amount, in value, of property of the United States. The committee has given the matter full consideration, and, being a unanimous report of the committee, I trust there will be no objection to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. This is virtually a pension for life. There is no telling what it will cost. It provides for the payment of \$66.67 per month. We have had men fight for our country and receive as great injuries who do not receive so much per month. There ought to be some rule applied in these cases.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator will permit me, the bill merely proposes to comply with the rule which has been already established in the case of Federal employees. This is a case of total blindness. If the individual had been an employee of the United States, he would have been entitled under existing law to precisely this amount of compensation. It is in order to conform with that law and put him in the same status as an employee that the bill is proposed to be amended by the committee. I think that the bill as amended by the committee complies with the suggestion which the Senator from Utah has just made.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not looked it up, and I do not know whether the amount is correct or not.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The report of the committee contains a statement from the department upon the subject. The department suggested the amount, in order to make it conform to what the beneficiary would have received had he been in the employ of the United States. That is all in the report of the committee. At the end of the report of the committee the Senator will find the statement from an official of the department.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that the department stated that the maximum compensation provided for employees of the United States is \$66.67 a month and suggested that the bill be changed so as to allow Mr. Hunter compensation in the sum of \$66.67, which is the provision of the amended bill. There can be no doubt that if the man had been in the employ of the Government he would have been entitled to this amount under the compensation law of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no such suggestion here. Mrs. Axtell, of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission says:

Senator HENDERSON's amendment appears to be in proper form to permit the commission to compensate Mr. Hunter in the manner outlined by the act of September 7, 1916. The maximum compensation provided for employees of the United States, however, is \$66.67 a month, whereas it would seem that the amendment contemplates that Mr. Hunter shall receive \$100 a month. I would suggest that the amended bill be changed to allow Mr. Hunter compensation in the sum of \$66.67 a month, which is the maximum allowed under the provision of section 6 of the compensation act. I would also suggest that the provisions of the compensation act might be extended to Mr. Hunter to take effect from September 7, 1916, the date of the passage of the act.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The committee advised that compensation should be fixed at the rate of \$100 a month. The department suggested that it ought to be reduced to the compensation allowed under the act.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether the injury occurred while the party was actually doing work for the Government?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is quite true, I may say to the Senator. He, together with other parties in the vicinity where the forest fire was raging, volunteered their services and went into the forest reserve and engaged in putting out a very large forest fire. In doing that he suffered injury to his eyes which resulted in total blindness. He has no means of support,

and, of course, is dependent upon others, as anyone would be who is totally blind. He is a young man about 22 or 23 years of age and through his whole future must suffer in that condition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose since we are going to enter upon the policy of having individuals outside of the Government service pensioned by the Government, this is just as good a way as any. Perhaps I had better not object to it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to award and pay to Reuben R. Hunter, of Deming, N. Mex., who suffered a total and permanent loss of sight in both eyes as a result of voluntarily fighting a forest fire on Government land in the vicinity of Clondcroft, Otero County, N. Mex., in May, 1904, in an effort to protect valuable standing timber and other property of the United States, compensation at the rate of \$66.67 per month, from September 7, 1916, for the period and in the manner provided by the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, for the payment of compensation for permanent disability of a civil employee resulting from personal injury sustained while engaged in the performance of his duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AWARD OF DECORATIONS.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to Senate bill 4432, which came up on the calendar during my temporary absence and was objected to. The bill was introduced by me.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think we had better proceed with the calendar in regular order and get through with it before returning to bills which have been objected to.

Mr. PHELAN. I submit that 2 o'clock may arrive before the regular call is completed.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the bill may be called up later.

Mr. KING. I join in the request of the Senator from California. The bill went over on my objection, but since talking with the Senator from California I think it is a measure which ought to be passed. It is a bill granting decorations and insignia to the next of kin of certain persons upon whom they were originally bestowed and who have since died.

Mr. PHELAN. It is Order of Business 592 on the calendar, and I trust the senior Senator from Utah will yield for its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill referred to; but I am going to object to the consideration of any other bills out of order. I should like to go on with the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill named by the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN]? The bill has been read.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4432) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever under the laws of the United States or under any rules and regulations of the War or Navy Departments made in conformity therewith any decoration, cross, medal, clasp, button, badge, ribbon, star, or other emblem, device, or insignia has been, or shall hereafter be, awarded to any person by reason of any act, deed, conduct, or service in, or in connection with, any war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has engaged or shall hereafter engage, and such person shall have died prior to receiving the same, said decoration, device, or insignia shall be delivered to such of the next of kin of the deceased person or to his widow, as the President may prescribe, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, and if such person has died or shall hereafter die prior to the award to which he would otherwise have been entitled such award may be posthumously made, in the discretion of the President, and such decoration, device, or insignia delivered to such next of kin, or to his widow, upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

Sec. 2. That honorable separation from the service of the United States of persons who would otherwise be entitled to receive them shall not prohibit or preclude the issuance to such persons of such decorations, devices, emblems, or insignia as may have been or as may hereafter be authorized, allowed, or ordered to be awarded, issued, or bestowed upon persons in the service of the United States; and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized, after the proper award thereof is made, to issue such decoration, device, emblem, or insignia to the former personnel of their respective departments so entitled thereto, regardless of their previous separation from the service of the United States: *Provided*, That such decorations, em-

blems, devices, or insignia will hereafter be issued without charge to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men entitled thereto.

Sec. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person to wear or to display upon his or her person within the United States or any other place subject to its jurisdiction with intent to deceive or mislead, any decoration, cross, medal, bar, clasp, button, star, ribbon, badge, stripe, or other emblem, insignia, or device heretofore or hereafter authorized, conferred, issued, or authorized to be worn under the laws of the United States, or under any rules and regulations of the War or Navy Departments made in conformity with the laws of the United States, by reason of, or to indicate heroic, distinguished, or meritorious acts, deeds, or conduct in the service of the United States, or honorable participation in the service of the United States in any war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been, or is, or shall be, a party, except the person upon account of whose acts, deeds, conduct, participation in, or connection with, such war, such emblem, insignia, or device was awarded, bestowed, or issued, or such other person as may be authorized by law or the order pursuant to which the same was awarded, bestowed, or issued to wear the same. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be punished by a fine not exceeding \$300 or imprisonment for not exceeding 90 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 4. That no print, cut, or pictorial representation of any medal, cross, clasp, button, badge, ribbon, emblem, or other decoration or award to any person by reason of any act, deed, conduct, or service in, or in connection with any war in which the United States has participated or may hereafter participate shall be used, published, printed, or exhibited on, or in connection with, an advertisement by any firm, company, or corporation for any purpose other than such as may be authorized by the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BUSINESS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 4372) to encourage the establishment of farms and suburban homes by veterans of the World War was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The next business on the calendar was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over to the county commissioners of Dickinson County, Kans., suitable pontoon equipment for temporary use across the Smoky Hill River at Chapman, Kans.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

The bill (H. R. 14441) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to ask my colleague whether this is the bill which finally came from conference and was passed by the other House?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill was passed by the other House, I will say to the Senator from Utah, in order to conform to the objection which was made to the original budget bill by the President. There are a number of Senators who desire when the bill comes up for consideration to be present. I know there are many Senators who feel that the bill as it was originally reported and passed the other House and first came to the Senate ought now to be insisted upon when the subject is considered by the Senate.

Mr. KING. I expressed the view some time ago that we ought to pass the bill over the President's veto, because I do not believe that the objection urged by the President was grounded upon a proper interpretation of the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection, the bill will be passed over.

WATER-POWER PROJECTS WITHIN NATIONAL PARKS.

The bill (S. 4554) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if objection was made to the present consideration of Senate bill 4554?

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] if this is the measure to which he referred?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KING. Then I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, power houses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1920, entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of the public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1920, as authorizes licensing such uses of national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed.

Mr. BORAH. That bill can not be disposed of this morning. The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senator from Idaho may object to its consideration.

Mr. BORAH. I object to its consideration.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in connection with the bill which has just been read. I was not able distinctly to hear the reading of the bill, but I understand that it was introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] for the purpose of eliminating national parks from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think, perhaps, it would be appropriate to say in this connection that the Senator from Washington, as well as myself, is under obligation to bring this matter to the consideration of the Senate with all speed, and unless there is some special reason I hope the measure will have consideration.

When the water power bill was transmitted to the Senate for consideration an objection was made—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to object to the remarks of the Senator from Montana, but I understand the bill is not under consideration. There was objection to the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I so understand; but I will take occasion at this time to say what I desire to say, with the permission of the Senate.

An objection was made to the bill by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Payne, upon the ground that it granted the water-power commission created by that act the authority to authorize the construction of dams for power purposes within the national parks, and it seemed not unlikely that the bill would be vetoed by the President in consequence of the objection to it thus pointed out by the Secretary of the Interior. In that connection the Senator from Washington and myself, both being very deeply interested in the speedy enactment of the measure, called upon the Secretary of the Interior and stated to him that if he would withdraw his objection to the bill we would at the ensuing session of Congress charge ourselves with the duty of introducing a bill to relieve the water-power measure of the objection and urge its passage upon the Senate. Accordingly, I feel obligated to do what I can to remove any objection that might be made against the bill. I feel that both of us stand pledged to do everything we can to expedite the passage of the bill.

In this connection I also desire to say, Mr. President, that in all of the long discussion of and consideration given to the water-power bill I do not recall that anybody ever called attention to the feature of that bill to which reference is now made. It was embodied in the bill as it was originally prepared by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture. It was not the subject of discussion upon the floor. Apparently it passed without any attention whatever being given to it. No one was particularly interested in it, so far as I can understand; yet, notwithstanding this condition of affairs, and the pledge given by the Senator from Washington as well as myself, a very active, energetic campaign is being waged, and the country is being deluged with appeals from civic associations of all kinds charging something in the nature of intrigue or indirection in getting this provision into the water-power bill and calling on all the friends of the national parks throughout the country to assist in sweeping away all possible objection to the legislation now proposed and speedily accomplishing its enactment, reminding one of some of the adventures of Don Quixote and his celebrated mount. I do not believe that there is any serious objection to the enactment of this measure. I hope that we shall have it speedily considered. I say this in explanation of my own attitude with respect to it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not going to stand in the way of the consideration of the bill if it comes up on a proper occasion when we can consider it for a reasonable length of time, but I do object to it at the present time. It is a matter of some importance, and we could not possibly dispose of it under the rules with the time which we have this morning.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will simply say that this is the first time I ever heard of any objection to the bill. It has

been reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce, I believe, and I never knew heretofore there were any objections to it.

Mr. BORAH. There are some objections to it, Mr. President, which have been presented to me. What my final attitude upon the bill will be I do not know, but it is a matter of a great deal of importance to some people. I therefore do not desire that the Senate shall undertake to dispose of it this morning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have been seeking to get this bill up for some time. I knew that the Senator from Idaho was interested in it, and possibly might have some objection to it. I have delayed asking for its consideration in order that the Senator from Idaho might procure some information concerning the bill which he desired to obtain. As I have said before, at the very first opportunity I expect to call the bill up. As the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has stated, I feel under obligation to do whatever may be possible to secure action upon the measure by the Senate, and I expect to secure such action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

COPPER RIVER & NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY CO.

The bill (S. 551) for the relief of the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Nevada, \$3,102.92, in refund of the gross income tax paid by that company to the collector of internal revenue at Tacoma, Wash., on May 21, 1915, pursuant to a tax levied under the act of Congress approved July 18, 1914 (38 Stat., p. 517), for the period beginning January 1 and ending June 30, 1914, for which period the company had previously paid the license fee or tax provided by the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., pp. 1336, 1337), as amended by the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat., pp. 330, 331).

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT OF PORTO RICO.

The bill (H. R. 11769) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 19 of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That no public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, used, directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution, or association, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary as such. Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited."

Sec. 2. That section 3 of said act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That no export duties shall be levied or collected on exports from Porto Rico, but taxes and assessments on property, internal revenue, and license fees, and royalties for franchises, privileges, and concessions may be imposed for the purposes of the insular and municipal governments, respectively, as may be provided and defined by the Legislature of Porto Rico; and, when necessary to anticipate taxes and revenues, bonds and other obligations may be issued by Porto Rico or any municipal government therein as may be provided by law, and to protect the public credit: *Provided, however,* That no public indebtedness of Porto Rico or of any subdivision or municipality thereof shall be authorized or allowed in excess of 10 per cent of the aggregate tax valuation of its property, and all bonds issued by the government of Porto Rico, or by its authority, shall be exempt from taxation by the Government of the United States or by the government of Porto Rico or of any political or municipal subdivision thereof, or by any State, or by any county, municipality, or other municipal subdivision of any State or Territory of the United States, or by the District of Columbia. In computing the indebtedness of the people of Porto Rico, bonds issued by the people of Porto Rico secured by an equivalent amount of bonds of municipal corporations or school boards of Porto Rico shall not be counted."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] the purpose of the bill and wherein it changes existing law?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it changes existing law in two particulars. The act "to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," which was approved March 2, 1917, contained this provision:

"That no public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, used, directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, sectarian institution, or association, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary as such. Contracting of polygamous or plural marriages hereafter is prohibited."

Or for charitable, industrial, educational, or benevolent purposes, to any person, corporation, or community not under the absolute control of Porto Rico.

The first change that is made is to leave out of the section which I have just read the words "or for charitable, industrial, educational, or benevolent purposes, to any person, corporation, or community not under the absolute control of Porto Rico."

The preceding part of the section as to religious sects, priests, and so forth, is left as it was originally.

The circumstances which suggested this amendment of the law were quite numerous. One of them, for instance, was the desire of Porto Rico to send 12 young men each year to the United States to be educated in the United States at the expense of the island. It was held by the Attorney General that under the provision which I have just read the island was prohibited from doing that.

Another case arose in the effort to provide money, at public expense, to be used by certain charitable institutions to take care of earthquake sufferers. That was prohibited by the provision which I have just read. That is the first change the bill makes in the existing law. The next change is simply to increase the amount of public indebtedness which the island may incur from 7 per cent of the taxable value of the property to 10 per cent, it having been demonstrated that in the town of San Juan, for instance, on account of the small taxable value of the property and the comparatively slow increase in wealth, the city was unable to provide an adequate water system under the limitation of 7 per cent. It was deemed by the House of Representatives and by the Senate committee that it was reasonable to increase the limit to 10 per cent.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether that limitation extends to municipalities and applies to public purposes of the character to which the Senator has just referred? The Senator will recall that in Territorial days the limitation placed by Congress upon the right of municipalities in the Territories to create indebtedness was fixed at 4 per cent. To go beyond that and permit an indebtedness of 10 per cent seems to me very dangerous. The conditions justifying such action must be extraordinary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. They are quite extraordinary. I think the Senator is justified in asking for information in regard to the matter, and I will call attention briefly to the conditions. The provisions of the existing law relate to municipalities. The law provides:

No public indebtedness of Porto Rico, or of any subdivision or municipality thereof, shall be authorized or allowed in excess of 7 per cent of the aggregate tax valuation of its property.

This amendment proposes to strike out "seven" and insert "ten." The consideration is stated as follows:

Porto Rico is as yet poor as compared with any portion of the United States. Under Spanish rule the island was kept poor by the exactions of the Spanish Government. Most of the accumulation of property has been made within 20 years under the American occupancy. Progress has been made which on the whole has been remarkable. Still it is impossible to provide for schools and the necessary public buildings and other improvements demanded by the progress and development of the island. Especially is this true in the remote rural sections and municipalities. The current rates of interest paid range from 10 to 18 per cent. The amount of money in circulation is very small, amounting to about \$4 per capita. Even the rapidly growing capital city, San Juan, finds it impossible to provide an adequate water system with the limitation of 7 per cent, as provided in the organic act. In many parts of the island schoolhouses can not be built to provide school facilities for the children because of this limitation. Only about 65 per cent of the school population have adequate school facilities.

It is a very bad condition, and it was considered that the circumstances justify this increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORCIBLE ENTRY AND DETAINER.

The bill (S. 4746) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in relation to forcible entry and detainer," was announced as next in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object to the consideration of that bill, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if I can, I desire to move to take up this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I understand under the unanimous-consent agreement only uncontested matters can be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not so construe the rule. The Chair thinks that is what Senators tried to do, but he does not think they did it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I beg the Chair's pardon. I assumed that we were proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement to consider uncontested matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; this is taking the place of Calendar Monday, and that rule reads:

Provided, however, That on Mondays the calendar shall be called under Rule VIII, and during the morning hour no motion shall be entertained to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar except the motion to continue the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject against objection as provided in Rule VIII.

It is provided in Rule VIII that when an objection is interposed a motion may be made to continue the consideration of the subject.

The Chair thinks that the Committee on Rules did not intend it that way, but the Chair is compelled to rule that on Calendar Monday no motion is in order to take up a bill until it is reached on the call of the calendar; and then, if there is an objection, that a motion may be made to continue the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to say that that will do away with Calendar Monday in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think it takes care of it. As one member of the Committee on Rules, I understood that it meant that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill regularly reached on the calendar could be made, and the Senate could permit it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. If the bill is taken up on motion, then is debate limited to five minutes?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Rule VIII expressly provides that if the Senate determines to proceed with the measure, the operation of the 5-minute rule ceases, and the measure can be considered in the usual way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4746) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, in relation to forcible entry and detainer."

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Ball	Harrison	Moses	Spencer
Borah	Heflin	New	Stanley
Brandegee	Henderson	Owen	Sterling
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Page	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Poincxter	Underwood
Elkins	Keyes	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fernald	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Reed	Warren
France	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Glass	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.	Willis
Gooding	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Md.	
Hale	McLean	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] is detained by reason of illness.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Johnson] are absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there has been no statement from the advocates of this bill, so far as I have been able to ascertain, indicating any emergency existing justifying its enactment. This bill, if it should be enacted, would deprive the District of Columbia of the ordinary and familiar remedy of any owner of property which is common to practically every State in the Union. It would require the owner of property to

bring a suit, at great expense and with great delay, in a court of record for ejectment before he could enforce the terms of a lease.

In the case of property of any kind, whether it is great or whether it is small, that is held by a tenant in the District of Columbia at a certain rental agreed upon in the contract, for a certain term, when that term expires the owner of the property has a right, under the Code of the District of Columbia, to bring suit for forcible entry and detainer in the magistrate's court to recover his property for any purpose for which he may want to use it, or for the purpose of selling it.

If this bill becomes a law he will be deprived of that remedy, and the tenant could continue indefinitely to hold the property after the term of the lease has expired, pending the prosecution of a suit in the Supreme Court of the District for its recovery. In that way it would limit one of the fundamental rights of a citizen of the United States. It would fundamentally change the nature of property in the District of Columbia, in so far as remedies for enforcing property rights are concerned. It is true that an owner could go into the Supreme Court and prosecute a case for its recovery, and would be required to do that, however plain and undisputed the facts might be as to the expiration of the lease.

When the war was on, when it was charged that the owners of property in the District of Columbia were guilty of profiteering, of unconscionable impositions upon people who were compelled to have houses or apartments in which to live, as a war measure probably Congress would have been justified in enacting such a law as this. It is possible that there may be conditions in the District of Columbia now which justify it, but I have not heard any statement of them at all. It seems to me that before Congress passes this measure and deprives the people of the District of Columbia of a remedy for the recovery of property, which is an ancient one and almost a universal one throughout the United States, there ought to be some showing made to Congress as to the need for such unusual legislation, and the need ought to be a very pressing one.

One of the fundamental elements of individual liberty in the United States is the right to the ownership of property. As I recollect it, that is one of the first things enumerated in the great Virginia Bill of Rights as constituting one of the inherent rights of man; that is, the right to own property. While this would not destroy the principle of property, it would modify and limit it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood the Senator to say that the bill would confer jurisdiction on the Supreme Court in such cases. I do not so read it. I understand that it refers to the municipal court, and that is not the court the Senator had in mind. I do not understand that the case must be brought in the Supreme Court. It is in the municipal court that the case is to be brought. Is not the Senator in error in regard to that?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think not. I think I am not in error. I may not have made my statement clear, and the fact that there is a misunderstanding about that illustrates, I think, the inadvisability of enacting this legislation at this time, without an opportunity for very full discussion of it.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator that he is in error in regard to that. It does not deprive the municipal court of jurisdiction. It simply gives a little longer notice to the tenant; that is all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My understanding is that it does deprive it of jurisdiction in the case I have mentioned. I am somewhat surprised to hear that there is any difference of opinion about that on the part of those who are familiar with the bill. As the law now stands, at the expiration of a lease, or for any forfeiture of a lease, the lessor can go into the municipal court and bring an action of forcible entry and detainer. The purpose of this bill is to amend the law of forcible entry and detainer and modify it, curtail it, so that only in certain particular cases can he go into the municipal court to recover, and in all cases except those which are enumerated in this amended law he will be compelled to go into the Supreme Court. Otherwise there is no purpose in passing the bill. If owners of property would have the same remedies after this bill was enacted, the action of forcible entry and detainer in the municipal court, that they have now under the Code of the District of Columbia, what is the purpose of enacting the bill? The purpose of the bill is to limit and to curtail the jurisdiction of the municipal court in those cases, to confine it to certain special conditions, and to leave the lessor to his remedy in the Supreme Court in all other cases.

That is the purpose of the bill. Otherwise, it has no purpose at all.

I stated a case where the lease had expired by limit of time. As the Code of the District of Columbia is now an action of forcible entry and detainer could be brought for the recovery of the property without giving any particular reason at all why the owner wanted to recover his property. He could recover it for any lawful use; he could recover it if he wanted to sell or convey it to somebody else on the expiration of the tenant's lease. But, if this bill passes, he could not bring an action of forcible entry and detainer in the municipal court, I will say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], because it is amended so as to limit it to certain specific cases, and the case of the expiration of the lease by time is not included within those specific cases.

There was an amendment agreed to on the floor of the Senate some time ago, as I recollect, while the bill was under consideration, somewhat enlarging the class of cases in which the lessor might bring an action of forcible entry and detainer, as compared with those which are mentioned in the original bill. But, notwithstanding the adoption of that amendment, he would be limited to a specified number of cases and conditions, and those do not include the expiration of the lease by time.

I do not think the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] will dispute that proposition. I think the Senator from Idaho will admit that if this bill passes, an action of forcible entry and detainer can not be brought in the municipal court, as it can be at the present time, under the code, in certain cases. It can only be brought in certain other cases which are specified in this bill. Among those cases is the one I have just mentioned, which is the most ordinary case, of expiration of a lease.

I assert that would be the effect of the passage of the bill, after considerable examination of it, and after hearing the debate and hearing the amendments which were offered by the Senator from South Dakota, and which were adopted on the floor of the Senate, which specified that if he desired to recover the property for the purpose of occupying it, the owner might recover it by the action of forcible entry and detainer, but did not specify a great number of cases which are included in the present code.

On the former discussion of the bill a case was called to the attention of the Senate in which the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, as I recollect it, had held that the general legislation relating to tenants and lessors which had been enacted by Congress during the war, providing for the creation of a rent commission, investing in that commission arbitrary power to fix rentals and to hold that certain rentals were unreasonable, was unconstitutional. They went into quite an extensive, and I think quite convincing, exposition of the law relative to property, and held that one of the essences of property was the right to sell it. If a man can not dispose of property which he owns, it is manifest that its value to him is lessened.

Notwithstanding the fact that that act was passed during the war, probably as a war measure, the court held that it was unconstitutional, a violation of the constitutional privileges of a citizen of the United States. I do not hold that this bill, if enacted, would be unconstitutional, and I only cite the case to which I have referred as bearing upon the general policy of this kind of legislation.

This bill, as it has been amended, would still vest in this rent commission power to fix the rates at which property shall be rented, and while it would not deprive the owner of all remedy in case he did not comply with the findings of the rent commission, it would deprive him of certain remedies. It would deprive him of a speedy remedy. It would deprive him of the privilege of going into the municipal court and filing an action of forcible entry and detainer, and recovering the property if the tenant of the property is willing to accept the rate that is fixed by this commission, which was established by Congress as one of the acts growing out of the emergencies of war, and compel the lessor to go into the Supreme Court of the District. Every lawyer in the Senate knows what that means. It means, in the first place, that he has to employ a lawyer and pay him a fee. He has to pay the costs of the proceeding in the supreme court, and he has to wait until the time of the summons has expired, he has to wait until the period for answer or demurrer has expired, and has to wait on the postponements of the case and continuation from week to week and month by month, which are familiar, and which obviously can be taken advantage of by any tenant occupying the property who desires to continue in its possession, when he really has no right to continue in it, because he is continuing in violation of the terms of his lease. That is the effect of this bill, and while probably it would not come within the ruling made by the Court of Appeals of the

District of Columbia, because it does leave him a remedy, such as it is, nevertheless it is a continuance of the same policy to the extent of depriving him of an adequate and speedy remedy, which was condemned by the court of appeals in the decision to which I have referred. I am not mistaken about that, I will say to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. We have only about a minute left. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to let the bill pass?

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it were a matter in which the Senator from Idaho had any personal interest, or if it affected his State, I would allow it to pass. But it is not a matter in which he is personally interested, and I believe it is a very important bill, and that the invasion of the rights of the individual citizen, in so far as remedies are concerned, which would result if this bill were passed, would be entirely unjustifiable in a time of profound peace, however the case might be in time of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products, to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill which has just been before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the unfinished business is the so-called emergency tariff bill, and that it is now the order of business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is now the business before the Senate, without a motion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A motion has been made to proceed to the consideration of the bill which has been before the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	New	Spencer
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Stanley
Curtis	Kellogg	Owen	Sutherland
Dial	Kendrick	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kenyon	Poinexter	Townsend
Edge	Keyes	Pomerene	Trammell
Elkins	King	Ransdell	Underwood
Fernald	La Follette	Reed	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lentfoot	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	Lodge	Sherman	Walsh, Mont.
Gooding	McCumber	Shields	Willis.
Gore	McKellar	Simmons	
Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that the motion which is now pending is the motion made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to proceed to the consideration of the bill that was before the Senate when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived. That is the motion which is pending?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the motion pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the Chair understands.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we have as the unfinished business the emergency tariff bill. A motion is made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to displace that as the unfinished business and to substitute therefor the bill pertaining to the matter of leases in the District of Columbia. The immediate question before the Senate is, therefore, the relative importance of the two bills and whether the emergency tariff bill reported by the Committee on Finance should give way to a bill the purpose of which is, as I understand, to enable tenants to hold over after the expiration of their lease.

While I can not speak at all for the landlords or for the tenants, as I am not acquainted with the particular wording of the bill, certainly the number affected by it are infinitesimal as compared with the vast number of people affected by this proposed emergency tariff legislation.

The emergency tariff bill covers generally agricultural products—the grain, stock-raising, meat, and wool industries. The population in the grain section of the Northwest affected directly and who are suffering most by reason of heavy importations—those in eastern Montana, all of North and South Dakota, and Minnesota—number about 4,500,000 people. The number

of people in the United States who are dependent upon grain raising may be fairly estimated at nearly 30,000,000 of people. So the real question here is whether the 30,000,000 people desperately interested in the result of legislation before the Senate shall have their bill swept aside for the interests of a few people in the District of Columbia who can not agree with their landlords as to whether they shall quit the premises.

I do not think that any Senator can fail to understand the desperate situation in certain agricultural sections of the United States. I will take the State of North Dakota alone, where, during the last two months, according to the last report that I have, 32 banks have failed. They include not only State banks, but also national banks. I have not seen any reports from that State for the last week, so it may be that three or four more banks have closed during that period. I find a somewhat similar situation affecting those who are interested in woolgrowing and in the banks that have been financing that industry.

The trouble in my State is due to two causes: First, a very light crop—and in some sections the crop has been light for several years—and, secondly, to the vast amount of importations absolutely duty free of the same kind of grain, which is ground at the same mills and produces the same grade of flour. So, Mr. President, I want to give somewhat in detail the situation in the northwestern section of this country where the farmers depend entirely upon their spring-wheat crop.

We may divide the United States, so far as wheat raising generally is concerned, into eight different sections, each one of those sections growing an entirely different kind and grade of wheat, each of which produces a different kind of flour. These different species of grain may be mixed to a slight extent, but only to a slight extent, without changing the grade of flour. Therefore, in considering the wheat question we must consider not only distinct species but those species as being produced in distinct sections of the country and in some instances far separated. You may raise a certain kind of melon in one section of the country and another kind of melon in another section of the country. While the price of one may affect the consumption of the other, they are not at all dependent upon each other for their particular value in the markets of the country.

We raise a wheat which produces what is called the "hard wheat flour," that has a reputation throughout the world. The millers of Minneapolis and the Northwest generally are engaged almost exclusively in the production of that kind of flour. They must depend upon the spring-wheat section of the United States to secure a sufficient number of bushels of wheat to meet their demands. If the production of wheat in that section is about equal to the consumption of the mills, we will generally secure a very fair price for our crop. If it is a little less than the consumption demand, our price very naturally advances. If we have proper protection the price may advance to the full extent of the protection. If there is a good crop in Canada—which raises exactly the same kind of grain that we do—even though our crop is below average, the moment that our price increases a few cents a bushel above the Canadian price the Canadian wheat, under absolutely free importation, naturally flows over the border and drives the price of the American product downward. Mr. President, that is the situation in our State.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator from North Dakota seriously contend that the mere difference of 1 or 2 or 3 cents a bushel in the price of wheat is going materially to change the market conditions along the border?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; of course it makes a difference when wheat comes into this country absolutely free. The Senator must cast his eye over the great Red River Valley, which is nearly 200 miles wide at the north end of my State, taking in Minnesota and North Dakota and extending as far north as Winnipeg. It produces the same kind of grain; there is not a foot of waste land; one field merges into another; and the railways all cross the line. Therefore the Canadian wheat is taken over the border and immediately drives down our prices to the Canadian level.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I do not care to interrupt the Senator's argument, but I remember the same argument was made during the pendency of the Canadian reciprocity measure.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. I remember that the Senator from North Dakota at that time made an argument along the same line that he is pursuing now. A few days after that he called attention to the fact that the wheat on the Canadian side was a

little lower than it was on this side, and about a week after that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] made a speech in support of the Canadian reciprocity measure and gave a list of, as I now recall, 20 or 25 different markets on both sides of the Canadian line in most of which the price of wheat on the Canadian side was higher than it was on this side.

I refer to these matters because I am not disturbed about the little differences in the market. I remember, for instance, in my own State, picking up the market reports as between Canton and Akron, 23 miles apart, both very substantial cities, and there may be a difference of 5 cents a bushel in the two markets. The same is true as between Akron and Dayton, or between Akron and Toledo. That condition may exist everywhere. A mere change of a few cents in one market or another means nothing as a general proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no; the mere fluctuation means nothing; but when the whole season's crop is held higher or lower, on a range of from 10 to 20 cents a bushel, it means a great deal. There may be a bullish market in Chicago; at the same time there may be a bearish market in Minneapolis; the one market price may go up and the other may go down, but the general trend of prices as between the two markets will bear about the same relation to each other, and the general trend between the Canadian and the American market will show exactly the same continued relation.

I know that it is often contended that our export market fixes the price of wheat. Mr. President, a great deal of wheat is raised in California, and a considerable portion of it used to go into the export trade. I do not know whether California now raises wheat for export; but suppose California should raise more wheat than could be consumed within the borders of the State or along the Pacific coast, what would she do with it? Would the price which she might receive affect the price of the wheat produced east of the Rocky Mountains? She could not ship her grain east of the Rocky Mountains; it would be impossible; the freight rates would eat it up before it got as far as Minneapolis. She could ship it to Shanghai or grind it into flour and export the flour to Shanghai, but her export price would have not the slightest effect upon the price of grain grown in Ohio or in Michigan or in the spring-wheat raising States. That is true to a certain extent of the grain raised in Texas and in Oklahoma and a portion of Kansas. That grain may find its market either in Kansas City or at the Gulf ports; they have their own market for that kind of wheat and their own market for the character of flour ground from that wheat. So of the grain raised in Ohio and West Virginia and Maryland. It is practically the same kind of grain, is sold in the same market, and makes the same kind of flour.

But what does fix the price of grain in the United States? Is there any general rule that can be applied? The general rule that can not be applied is what is called the Liverpool market. The general rule which can be applied is the rule of world production and consumption; that rule affects the market price of all grains throughout the world. But the most important thing that fixes the price of the American wheat is the price at the principal place of consumption.

The principal place of consumption for the wheat raised in the United States is the United States. It would be foolish to claim if we consume 650,000,000 bushels of wheat in the United States and 100,000,000 bushels of American wheat are consumed in England that the English price rather than the consumption price in America fixes the price of our product. Of course, there will be a relation between the two, because both are affected by the world's supply and demand.

As I remember, in 1909 or 1910 we had rather a short crop in the Northwestern States, and Liverpool and Minneapolis quoted practically the same price for the same kind of grain for several months during the time that the crop was being raised. Why? Because at that time we had a tariff barrier of from 25 to 30 cents a bushel. The American buying Canadian wheat would be compelled to pay the tariff. Our crop being light—and it is when the crop is light that the wheat farmer is entitled to the better price—the millers had to raise the price in order to continue the proper flow of grain. So our prices stayed up to about the Liverpool price, simply because the Canadian grain could not come in without paying a duty. Therefore, the theory that the price of American wheat is fixed by Liverpool is a fallacy of the worst character. The price is fixed by the world's supply and demand, and is affected more seriously by the supply and demand in the United States.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Senate, before I get down to the real crux of this situation, to certain facts that bear directly upon it. I want to take cognizance of the 1920 crop of the United States and Canada.

The estimated crop of the United States for 1920 is 789,878,000 bushels. We shall need for food, according to this estimate,

530,000,000 bushels, and for seed 82,000,000 bushels, leaving us a surplus of the 1920 crop for export of 177,878,000 bushels. Turning to Canada, we find that their estimated crop for 1920 is 293,361,000 bushels. They will need for food in Canada 45,000,000 bushels, and for seed 28,000,000 bushels, leaving a surplus of Canadian wheat to be exported of 220,361,000 bushels. So you will see that while we have for export of our 1920 crop only about 178,000,000 bushels, Canada has for export of her 1920 crop, of exactly the same kind of wheat, about 220,000,000 bushels. I have not included whatever surplus might have remained in the United States and in Canada from the 1919 crop, but I assume that the relative proportions after making allowance for this surplus will be about the same.

Canada, having 220,000,000 bushels of wheat to export, must necessarily look for the best market in which she can dispose of that grain. Of course, she will send it to the nearest market if she can secure as good a price as she can by sending it across the ocean to a foreign market; and here comes into play the difference in the exchange of the American dollar and the Canadian dollar.

Take a period of about the last three months, and I think the difference is about 15 per cent in favor of the American dollar. Therefore, Canada can not only put her wheat into the United States free, but, measured by the Canadian dollar and the American dollar, she can sell it in the United States at an advantage of 15 per cent over the Canadian price without paying any tariff whatever. That gives the importer a vast advantage. On every dollar's worth of imported wheat he can make 15 cents by reason of the difference in exchange.

Now, I want to show Senators just exactly how this will operate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply want to ask the Senator if he has taken the trouble to ascertain, in case a certain quantity of wheat is exported to this country from Canada, and in case that wheat is here converted into flour, or is exported from the warehouses here directly to Great Britain or to any European port, whether—

Mr. McCUMBER. Some of it will be converted into flour for export, but only a small proportion. By far the greater proportion is converted into flour and sold in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. But that is not the question which I proposed to ask the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thought that was the question.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was simply prefacing my question by that statement. My question is this: In case wheat purchased in this country from Canada is exported from this country to Europe, either in the form of flour or in the form of wheat, what will be the advantage in the price that we will be able to get for that wheat in Europe by reason of the difference in exchange value as compared with the advantage which the Canadian would get on the same quantity of wheat if imported into this country for the same reason?

Mr. McCUMBER. The general advantage is this: You glut the market at any time with any wheat, you have more than the mills can take care of, and you destroy the immediate demand, and that necessarily sends prices downward. Some of this wheat, we will say, is converted into flour, and we will say that some of that flour is exported.

I do not know whether or not we can say that it would be the same flour, but we will say that an equal amount of flour will be exported. Of course, there is a profit on the flour, or it would not be exported at all; but remember, it is bought with depreciated Canadian money, it is sold when it gets to Europe on the basis of the appreciated American dollar, rather than upon the basis of the British currency.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am not sure that I have yet conveyed to the Senator from North Dakota the thought that I had in my mind. It is this: Of course the difference in exchange in our favor in all international transactions between this country and Canada would give the Canadian an advantage, because of that difference in exchange, in his sales in this market.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would give the person who buys it an advantage.

Mr. SIMMONS. It would give him an advantage in his sales on this market. On the other hand, in our sales of commodities of any character whatsoever—not only of wheat, but of any character whatsoever—to Great Britain, by reason of the same difference in exchange, the advantage is very much in our favor. Now, I ask the Senator if he has compared these advantages and disadvantages, and ascertained whether the advantage of the

Canadian in the sale of the wheat to this country was greater or less than the advantage of the American in the sale of that identical wheat, or some equal quantity of wheat, to Europe by reason of the difference in exchange?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not considering so much the advantage of the Canadian as I am considering the advantage of the American buyer in buying Canadian wheat with a depreciated Canadian dollar, bringing it into the United States, and either selling it for the advanced value of the American dollar or exporting it upon the American-dollar basis with the advantage in our favor as against Great Britain, the country which takes most of our wheat and flour.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator that I have not asked this question in any controversial spirit.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that.

Mr. SIMMONS. But it occurred to me, in listening to the Senator, that it would be exceedingly enlightening to us, in considering the effect of this difference in exchange in our favor, to know in a concrete case—that of wheat—whether that difference was greater in favor of Canada when we purchase from that country or in our favor when we sell that identical wheat to a European country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator can very easily make that computation.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought probably the Senator had made it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not compared it with the British pound. The Senator can easily make the computation by ascertaining the average difference between the American gold dollar and the English currency and find out in that way what advantage we would have over the English in selling to Great Britain.

Let me make this clear. Taking a simple case, suppose that wheat was worth \$1 a bushel in Canada in Canadian money and the American bought it for a dollar. It was worth a dollar in the United States, but the Canadian dollar was worth only 85 cents. Therefore he really purchased it in Canada for 85 cents. The moment he gets it over here, based upon the American dollar, where the quotations are the same, he sells it for a dollar and makes 15 cents a bushel.

Now, holding his dollar-a-bushel wheat, we will suppose that he sells it to Great Britain. When he sells it to Great Britain he does not sell it upon the basis of the depreciated price of the British currency, but he sells it upon the American-dollar price; and if the British money is 15 per cent below the American dollar in value the British will have to pay 15 per cent higher when they purchase the American flour. Just what that difference may be I do not know, because I have made no computation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the Senator will understand that I do not mean to say that there is any difficulty in making this calculation, and I should not have interrupted the Senator with this inquiry if I had not supposed that probably he had already made it.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I have not made the computation comparing the British pound and its present depreciated value, because I was more directly interested in the question of imports and their effect.

Now, I want to give practically the same concrete case that I gave in the committee, which will explain this matter more clearly.

In the month of October, 1913, we imported from Canada 231,464 bushels of wheat. You will see that that was a little over a quarter of a million bushels for the entire year. Now, compare that with the month of October, 1920, when we imported 9,784,307 bushels of which we have a record, or about forty times as many bushels. In fact, we imported very much more, as I can easily explain to the Senator. Along the entire northern line of North Dakota there are elevators on both sides of the boundary on each railway that crosses.

The Canadian during a tariff period can not bring his grain across, even though the elevator may be very much nearer than any elevator in his own country. But the moment you take off your tariff provision and remove your inspectors and agents millions of bushels will come over the border into American elevators of which there is no record whatever, because there is no occasion for making a record.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. Between 1910 and 1920, taking the entire shipments of wheat from Canada into the United States, imports have exceeded the exports by about 8,000,000 bushels, I believe, for the whole 10 years.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know that I understand the Senator. Does he mean that imports of wheat from Canada exceed exports of wheat to Canada?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not give the figures exactly, but in 10 years, according to the reports made by the Department of Commerce, the excess of imports, as I understand, was about 8,000,000 bushels.

Mr. McCUMBER. The exports to Canada were almost nothing, were they not?

Mr. STANLEY. No; the exports to Canada and the imports from Canada were in the aggregate over 100,000,000 bushels in all. Fifty-eight million bushels moved one way and a little over 50,000,000 the other.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me to correct him, or at least place his statement so that it will be better understood, he includes both the wheat and flour. In other words, in the estimates as to the number of bushels which may be exported from Canada I think he will find that most of it is represented in the form of flour and figured upon the basis of 43 bushels to the barrel.

Mr. STANLEY. No; they gave the flour separately. I was surprised to find that up until the last three years exports and imports of wheat had depended upon the nearness of elevators or the facilities for travel, and that there seemed to be no general movement of grain either one way or the other, no great excess either of export or import. But what I wished to ask the Senator was this, To what does he attribute the recent excess of imports of wheat?

Mr. McCUMBER. There are two reasons, Mr. President. The one is the better price. The second is that during 10 years we have had a tariff, and during those years much of the imports have been in bond, the goods simply being imported and shipped right through, by reason of our railways being better equipped, or something of that character. These imports could not be used in the United States, because after paying the tariff there would be no profits. That would account for those being imported in bond; and, of course, as a rule, we have railways along the border which are a little more convenient to all sections than even the Canadians have.

Mr. STANLEY. It has been some time since we have had any considerable duty on wheat to Canada. Does not the Senator believe that this present movement of wheat is due entirely to the difference in the rate of exchange between the two countries?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; not in the Northwest; not entirely; but to a great extent it is due to it. The other feature I mentioned was the rather short crop in the spring-wheat section.

Mr. STANLEY. If it is due to the rate of exchange, it is probable that that matter will adjust itself.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; undoubtedly it will, some time; but that may be years.

Mr. STANLEY. And if it does not adjust itself, the difference in the rate of exchange would in that case measure the amount of duty which would be necessary to prevent this excess of imports, would it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; if we should make the rate of duty equal to the difference in the rate of exchange, they would be put upon a parity, of course. That would be equivalent then to free trade. At present it is a little better than free trade for the importer.

Mr. STANLEY. The proposed duty is more than double the difference in the rate?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; the proposed duty is to give the American farmer a protection. The proposed duty is to raise the price of his product so that it will measure up somewhere near to what it costs to raise it in the United States. We are trying to give the farmers of the United States a special benefit by this proposed legislation, because of their deplorable condition, which has flowed from the heavy importations of wheat from Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon, and with this question I conclude. Does the Senator believe that a duty sufficiently high upon all agricultural products to prevent any degree of importation from Canada would be a beneficial thing at this time?

Mr. McCUMBER. I certainly do, Mr. President. I would not be supporting this bill if I did not.

Mr. STANLEY. Would not such a duty exclude exports from the United States to Canada, as well as imports from Canada to the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President, it would not. Canada is going to buy the things she wants where she can get them the

cheapest. If she can get them cheaper in the United States, she will get them from the United States. If she can get them cheaper from Great Britain, she will get them from Great Britain. People sell where they can get the most for their products and they buy where they can buy cheapest; and we are not going to change that rule of human conduct.

Of course, Mr. President, you may say that if we will help enrich Canada, Canada may buy more from us. But that will depend on whether we can sell cheaper than some other country from which Canada can buy.

Mr. STANLEY. International trade is a matter of international barter. The Senator surely does not believe we can erect a wall which will impede the flow of traffic into the United States but will not impede the flow of traffic out of the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can answer that in a nutshell. For more than 50 years Great Britain has taken practically half of all the exports of the United States. For more than 50 years our exports to Great Britain have been about double what our imports from Great Britain have been. Great Britain has lived during those years, and we have gotten a better price for our products because we held the tariff wall, and it has not destroyed either of the countries. Great Britain made up her differences somewhere else. She may have had a trade with other countries, and her monetary interests, her loans, her investments in other countries might have equalled the difference, so as to place her on more or less of an equality with the United States. But Great Britain bought her wheat and her meats during all of that time where she could buy cheapest. She bought from the United States because she had to. We sold there because we could get a better price there than possibly we could get anywhere else.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose the Senator knows, of course, that the great bulk of the commodities which we sold to Great Britain, including cotton, were agricultural products—

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Which had at the time practically no protection here.

Mr. McCUMBER. We did not need much protection here until the Great Canadian northwest was developed, and then we had protection most of the time.

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to ask a question in connection with that. I have always understood that the difference between our exports and British imports was made up by Great Britain through the investments which she had in the United States prior to the war.

Mr. McCUMBER. Which she had all over the world.

Mr. THOMAS. But the Senator, of course, knows that the importations of Canadian wheat into the United States are not paid for in money. They are paid for in articles of commerce and merchandise which are obtained in exchange, of course, Canada being able now to make these exchanges with profit to herself, because of the difference in the value of her money as compared with that of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; I do not understand that the exchange is not made in money. We do not trade so many yards of cloth for so much wheat. We pay money for the wheat, and Canada pays money for the cloth. Whatever we import is always converted into money first, and that money will always buy where it will buy cheapest.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator knows the money to which he refers is in the form of acceptances, which represent exports and imports, the only money changing hands being the amount of the difference between the two?

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; it is not always represented in that way. Of course, it is very convenient, so far as it can go, to exchange it that way; but if Great Britain sends us one billion and buys from us \$4,000,000,000 worth of property, it can not all be settled for in acceptances between the two, because our credits are four times as much as that of Great Britain, and the difference must be represented in cash. Of course, the money is not transferred from one country to the other except to cover the balance due one country or the other.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, assuming for the sake of the argument that the Senator is correct, that in our dealings with Great Britain will she continue on the former basis notwithstanding our tariff legislation, or the height of our tariff wall, and will permit us to exclude her commodities without a reciprocal exclusion on her part?

Mr. McCUMBER. She has done it for 50 years, and she will probably continue it just so long as it is to her advantage to do so.

Mr. STANLEY. Assuming that to be true, Canada's policy has been the other way, has it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada has had some protection.

Mr. STANLEY. Canada has been in the habit of levying duties on her products, and of adopting retaliatory measures?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. And she will in all human probability continue that policy?

Mr. McCUMBER. She is doing it now.

Mr. STANLEY. And whenever we put a duty on wheat she will put a duty on some other article?

Mr. McCUMBER. She is doing that this very moment. We are taking everything Canada exports without one penny of duty, while on practically everything we send over to Canada she collects a tariff, and she will continue to do that as long as it is to her advantage to do so, and she will continue to take advantage of our situation to allow her chief products to come in free, while she charges us from 10 to 30 per cent ad valorem duty on the things we send to Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. Has the Senator any statement of the excess of Canadian duties upon imports from this country over our duties on imports into the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada imports manufactured products. She exports agricultural products. She has a duty levied upon all manufactured products, so far as I know. We have no duty levied upon our importation of agricultural products from Canada.

Mr. STANLEY. I am sure the Senator is laboring under a misapprehension. Canada is to-day, and has been for the last 10 years, purchasing much more of our agricultural products than she has ever sold. In tobacco alone Canada purchases more than the entire excess of her wheat exportations in the last 10 years.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, Mr. President, Canada does not raise any tobacco, and she has to import it, and as Canadians are all good smokers, they buy the American product. They would buy it somewhere else if they could buy it cheaper.

Mr. STANLEY. She can buy her tobacco elsewhere. She imports enormous quantities of peanuts, but she can buy them elsewhere. She imports millions of dollars worth of flaxseed every year, but she can buy that elsewhere. She imports fruits of all kinds, millions of dollars worth, but she can buy them elsewhere. If the bill becomes a law and goes into effect and Canada reciprocates by raising her tariff duties over what they are now proportionately to what we raise ours, the naked loss in trade to the United States will be five times as great as the total of the wheat importation into the United States, and if Canada reciprocates by putting an export duty on pulp paper and we take \$500,000,000 worth of it a year, the amount of wheat sold will be a mere bagatelle in comparison with that stupendous loss.

Mr. McCUMBER. Canada is not going to cut her own throat in any kind of a commercial war between herself and the United States. When we send our tobacco over to Canada she collects duty, and a good duty, too. When she sends her wheat into the United States we do not collect one penny of duty. If we are going to have reciprocity, let us have it. The advantage to-day is entirely with the Canadians. We can not send a thing over there on which we do not pay a duty. If she can get her peanuts any cheaper in China than she can get them from North or South Carolina, she is going to get them from China, tariff or no tariff. When the merchant buys his stock to sell he buys it where he can buy it the cheapest. In business he is not possessed of a single ounce of international altruism. He does not care anything for reciprocity. What he is looking for is the price at which he can buy a thing and the price at which he can sell it. The idea that we can not sell to any country unless we buy freely what that country produces has not the slightest application in this case.

But, Mr. President, I was diverted a little while. I was showing the difference between the Canadian exports to the United States for the years just prior to the war and for the year 1920. I showed that in October, 1920, the Canadian imports were forty times as much as they were in any month of a previous year. In November, 1913, we imported 104,000 bushels, while our importations in 1920 for the same month were about 10,000,000 bushels. In December, 1913, we imported 127,000 bushels, and that was all, while in December, 1920, we imported 12,000,000 bushels, or one hundred times as many bushels in November, 1920, as we imported in November, 1913.

The excessive importations of wheat began about the middle of September, 1920. I wish Senators who think these importations had no influence upon our prices to note the decline in the price of American wheat concurrent with the vast importations of Canadian wheat. The Modern Miller, in Russell's weekly wheat report, shows the importation from Canada for the whole year—and that has all come within a few months—of 53,000,000 bushels, while the imports of wheat converted into flour, or flour with its equivalent in wheat, were 3,390,475 bushels. This would give us a total importation of wheat from the 1920 crop of about 61,390,475 bushels, and this, added to our 178,000,000 bushels for export, would force us to provide for the export of 239,268,475 bushels of the 1920 crop.

If that were all we had to look out for, we might cease our concern, because Canada has already imported that, and any legislation that we can pass will not affect the amount of grain that is in the United States that is at present depressing our crop price. But when we stop to consider there are 150,000,000 bushels more in the same granary, that has ceased moving only because of the frozen lakes, then we can see what the result will be the moment the transportation is reopened.

I have already spoken of the exchange and the difference in exchange. I wish to present that so that Senators will not misunderstand the operation of the law of supply and demand as affected by the difference in exchange.

On December 14, 1920—and I take that because that is the date on which I looked up the situation—No. 1 hard wheat in Chicago was \$1.84 per bushel. On the same day No. 1 hard Winnipeg Canadian wheat was \$1.85 per bushel. It was really 1 cent a bushel higher than ours on that same day in Canadian currency. However, we must not be misled too much by that alone, because the Canadian No. 1 hard is a better wheat for flour than the American No. 1 hard, not because of the difference in the quality of the two wheats, but because the Canadian rules for grading require a greater proportion of actual hard wheat for No. 1 hard than is required in Minneapolis.

Under ordinary conditions, I presume that would make 5 cents difference in value of the Canadian wheat over our No. 1 hard. At present prices it might make even 8 cents a bushel difference.

Let us see how this exchange difference is taken advantage of by the importer to the detriment of the producer. The average rate of Canadian exchange in American money during several months past has been approximately 15 per cent. On wheat, at \$1.84 per bushel, Chicago, the difference in rate of exchange would make a difference of 27 cents a bushel. The bill proposes a duty of 30 cents per bushel, which would be 3 cents above the exchange difference, and has been amended in the committee to 40 cents, which would give an actual protection of about 13 cents per bushel. The price of No. 1 hard wheat in Winnipeg, Canadian currency, was then \$1.85, less 15 per cent exchange, which would be 27½ cents, making the price in Winnipeg, in United States currency, \$1.85, less 27½ cents, or \$1.57½. That is really what the American paid when he bought in Canada.

I think that I ought to explain again, because Senators do not seem to understand that Winnipeg quotations do not mean wheat delivered in Winnipeg. Winnipeg is not a wheat market at all. These quotations are for wheat delivered at some point on the Lakes, either at Fort William, Port Huron, or some other point of Lake export, and have nothing to do with the local price in Winnipeg.

The Chicago market of \$1.84, less \$1.57½, means 27½ cents per bushel that the American would make in buying Canadian grain quoted at the same price, or even 1 cent a bushel more than the American wheat. So that Senators can see why it is that we have been bringing in this vast quantity of wheat.

If we will look at the prices of grain during the months this enormous quantity was coming into the United States, we will find that the price of the American product went down just to the extent that Canadian grain was shipped into the United States. I will begin with September 13, 1920. I have only taken my figures from the weekly reports, and therefore this was the end of the week on September 13.

Wheat, No. 1 northern, which is our standard grade in Minneapolis, was \$2.63½ cents per bushel on that date. Just at this time began the importation. Between that date, September 13, and October 1 there were imported about 1,750,000 bushels, far more than were exported on the average in any previous single year, and on October 4 the price had gone down to \$2.07, a loss of 61½ cents per bushel. That was not because of just this one importation, but because there were 200,000,000 bushels more of the same wheat that was ready to come into the American market.

During the month of October the report shows that Canada exported into the United States 9,800,438 bushels. In Novem-

ber we imported wheat to the amount of 10,000,000 bushels, and on November 29 the same grade of wheat had dropped to \$1.53 a bushel, making a total loss since September 13 of \$1.15½ per bushel. I do not know whether this has reached the lowest possible level or not.

We hear considerably about the raising of the price to the ultimate consumer. I wish to heaven that some Senators could have gone out onto some of the farms in my State and western Minnesota last fall, when the grain crop was so poor and producing so little in the straw that it cost from 30 to 40 cents a bushel for thrashing alone, and have seen the farmers, some of whom rented their farms, attempting to struggle along, exchanging work with each other when they could, for they were unable to pay the enormous prices that were demanded for labor. Labor required to perform the work on the farm at that time commanded from \$6 to \$8 a day in the busy season of the year. There was not a farmer, of course, who could have paid it. He could not have paid it even in good times. A bill has been introduced and is being pressed by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to pay as the lowest minimum wage \$1,080 a year. What a heaven that would afford for five or six different families out there upon the prairies during the hard, cold winter!

I have occasion sometimes as I drive home in this city to see the young girls piling out of Government offices, and I can not help but note the fine furs that nearly all of them are wearing; they are queenly dressed as compared with the poor and rather shabby dresses and old shawls and old, threadbare coats that I see worn by the mothers and daughters who are struggling upon the farm; yet it is proposed to give \$1,080 a year to every one of these finely clad girls as the very minimum, and from that up to \$2,000 a year.

I wish to heaven that you could appreciate the real situation. I think the time is coming when we have got to recognize in this country that the man who raises wheat or raises cotton has as much right to live as has the laborer in the city or the Government; that he has a right—a God-given right—to receive a compensation that will measure up proportionately to the comparatively enormous wages that must be paid in every city in the United States to maintain the standard of high living in the cities.

A short time ago, while visiting in California and stopping at a certain place, I saw every day a beautiful limousine come up to a house on the opposite side of the street. I asked for what the limousine was used and whose it was. I was answered that it belonged to the colored cook, who every day made the journey to cook for the family living there, for which service she received a hundred dollars a month. It is desired to protect that class; it is proposed to pass a bill here to provide that no laborer working for the Government shall be paid less than \$1,080 a year; but the moment the Congress is asked to do something for the struggling people upon the farms, who have not any money with which to go to the movies or to pay \$4 for a theater seat, they are struck with horror because it will raise the price of bread to poor laboring people. I think that the farmer has as much right to clothe his wife and his daughters and his sons decently as the people in the cities have to spend hundreds of dollars for shows, and who keep every one of the amusement places packed from top to bottom during the entire year.

What awful offense is there in asking for legislation favorable to the farmers? The man who in the city gets \$8 for a day and a quarter's work can with that amount buy a barrel of flour, which is all he uses for himself for the entire year; in other words, the wage of one and a quarter days' work of a carpenter in the city of Washington buys all the flour that carpenter uses during an entire year. If the price of flour should be doubled from what it is to-day, he would have to do two and a half days' work in order to enable him to secure flour to last him the whole year. What an awful imposition that would be!

Suppose that even 50 cents a bushel were added to the price of wheat—and the pending bill only proposes a duty of 40 cents; and would only give a real protection of 13 cents—and if were passed on to the ultimate consumer, that would add but \$2.25, we will say, to a barrel of flour. It would make the carpenter work one-quarter of a day longer than he is now working in order to get the farmer's wheat for a year's supply. It would not mean anything to him, but it would mean an immense amount to the farmer who is to-day struggling, and to the banks that have been trying to supply him with funds in the falling market and have extended their credit until in some cases they have had to close their doors.

I am merely pleading for justice to the producers on the farm. Senators talk about enacting legislation which will tend

to send people out of the cities and back to the farm. If it is desired to make farming more attractive, there is but one thing, Mr. President, which attracts people in this world, and that is the luring glow of the gold, the glitter of the dollar. Whenever you make farming pay, whenever you so legislate as to give the American market to the American farmer—who, before Heaven, has earned it—you will do something to bring the people out of the cities onto the farms; but just so long as the laborer can get ten times as much in the city as he can on the farm, and so long as he can have the pleasures of city life, denied to the farmer, you are not going to induce him by any kind of suggestion to get out onto the farm.

The virtue I see in the bill of the Senator from California providing a minimum wage is that it raises the wages of the least-paid employees and brings them nearer to a righteous standard. Now, let us do the same for the farmer. Nothing on earth we can do for him will, within our lifetime, place him on a parity with those living in our cities, so far as the ease and pleasures of life are concerned; but we can help him. How? By giving him the American market, which belongs to him, by giving him that advantage over the foreign producers.

The price of land in Canada is not half what it is in my State; the farmer in America has got to pay a greater interest charge if he purchases land. Why, then, let the cheaper produced commodity of Canada, grown upon cheaper land, even though the cost of labor in the western portion of Canada may be nearly equal to that in northern United States, absorb our market to the detriment of our own people?

Mr. President, I am speaking only for the wheat section. There are other Senators who can discuss this bill as it affects the wool producer much better than can I. I am merely asking for justice for a section of the country which is in sore need. I am appealing to Senators to lay aside their purpose to blockade a bill that is designed to aid a class of people who, God knows, need it to-day. Let those who desire present their arguments in opposition to the position which I am taking, but when they have stated their arguments and have explained their attitude let us come to a vote and determine whether or not a majority of the Senate desires to extend a helping hand.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I am always interested in what the Senator from North Dakota says, particularly when he speaks of the distress of the farmers of North Dakota. Some of them have been in distress; their crops have been blighted by inclement weather and by other causes; I realize that very fully; but I wish to put a question to the Senator. Last week I was in the city of Cincinnati. Upon inquiry I found that the shops there were only running about 40 per cent of their capacity. I am advised that in the great iron and steel centers of Ohio the mills are running about 50 per cent of their capacity. I have in mind at the present time a great manufacturing plant which ordinarily employs about 30,000 men, but which to-day is employing about 7,000. I have in mind another plant which employs, ordinarily, about 9,000 men; it is closed down now. I have in mind another plant that employs, ordinarily, about 4,800 men, whereas now it is employing about 700 men. There is not an industrial center in the State of Ohio or in western Pennsylvania or in New York or Illinois that is not more or less very seriously affected by nonemployment. The other day, adding to my distress of mind, when I picked up one of the Ohio newspapers I found that in the city of Toledo already there had been formed a bread line of 2,000 men; and a day later I found on reading another newspaper that that morning the authorities had to feed 1,200 men for breakfast and to give them baskets of food to take home to their families. Then, I turn to this bill, and I find a duty placed on wheat; I find 8 cents a pound duty added to butter, and as much added to cheese, and in the same relative proportion increased duty is proposed to be levied upon nearly all the substantial food products of the country. What are we to do for those who are now out of employment?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Some days ago I offered an amendment to the pending bill and was accused by the newspapers of being facetious. The amendment provided that the revenues to be derived from the bill should be devoted to supporting those who are involuntarily out of employment. It occurred to me that if we were going to protect one suffering class of the community, the same motives and the same purposes sought to be subserved would apply equally to other needy members of

society. To the extent to which that amendment may be effective it might afford some relief in the direction to which the Senator's remarks are leading.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, that would have the merit at least of having some equity in it; but I can not understand the frame of mind of men who approach this subject when we know, if we believe one-half of what is in the public prints, that to-day there are at least three or four million men out of employment; and when they are out of employment, if they do not have credit at their little groceries, we know that they and their families are in distress. That is the situation with these men.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, does the Senator want me to answer him?

Mr. POMERENE. I intended to put that as a question.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am ready to answer it at any time.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well; I shall be very glad to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, many of the mills have closed down. Why? I think the Senator from Ohio understands that matter about as well as I do. We put wages up—and when I say “we” I mean the Government—so enormously above what the American people could possibly stand that there must come a reaction. As the wages went up during our war, the Senator knows as well as I do that efficiency went down. Now, you can not get over that situation in a day.

Mr. POMERENE. And, Mr. President, that was true on the farm as well as in the factory.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly it was. The farmer suffered from that—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment; let me finish. The farmer suffered from that as well as anyone else. Now, I say, you can not mend that in a day. We went on immediately after the war demanding and receiving the same wage, and with little change in efficiency. Efficiency began to go up only to the extent that mills began to close, and people were fearful of losing their jobs. The result of it all was that you sent the price of every commodity up to such an extent that you depleted the public pocket-book. Never was there a time when the retailers made such enormous profits; never was there a time when the manufacturers themselves made such enormous profits; and as long as the high wages continued, and nearly everyone could get work at those high wages, you could continue the big prices. We were living on credit and a day of payment was inevitable. When the slump came it came all at once. We all had our pocketbooks emptied about the same time, and we all stopped buying.

Then the price of everything necessarily tumbled. People are not willing to go to work at the old price and with the old efficiency. They are not willing to labor for a price for which you can afford to hire them.

I want you to go and try to hire one of those men to-day whom you say you are feeding for a price that you can afford to pay him. What is his answer? “No.” I want you to go to some of the women and girls in those families, and say that your family is sick, your wife can not do the work, and you want to get some one to help her. Will you get anyone? No. Why? Because the wage she will demand will be beyond your ability to pay. Only the rich can afford to have domestic help to-day. These people will not do that kind of work. You could not get that character of service if you were to pay \$50 a month, and board amounting to another \$50, making an equivalent of \$100 a month. These people can get work, in my opinion, if they will consent to work for what the manufacturer can afford to pay and sell his goods for what the public can afford to pay for the goods.

We have all got to come down to bottom rock again. It does not make much difference which one comes down first. I think we had better all come down together, and go to work to produce goods for what the goods will sell for in the market, and that would start every wheel of industry to moving.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I agree with the last statement made by the Senator, to the effect that we should all come down together; but while we are coming down we ought not to make food products higher in price.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the food product—I am speaking now of bread—is the cheapest thing in the United States to-day, then it ought to be brought up to a price where the producer can live; and the Senator knows as well as I do that, measured by the amount of energy that produces a bushel of wheat or a barrel of flour, these two are the cheapest things in the United States to-day.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. I understood the Senator from North Dakota to say that the Government had put up wages, and I understood the Senator from Ohio to concur. I was a little surprised—

Mr. POMERENE. Not in the statement that the Government put up the wages. I concurred in the statement that all should come down together.

Mr. STANLEY. I assumed as much.

Mr. POMERENE. Why, certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. I was a little surprised that my colleague from Ohio should get away from the proposition that supply and demand had something to do with the price of labor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, we are not blind. All of us can remember when all of these buildings around the Capitol were going up during the war. The Senator knows the kind of labor that was performed there. The Senator can not be blind to the reports that have been made by the investigating committees in the case of all the war activities, showing the slacking everywhere; and every time a strike was threatened the Government surrendered. The administration surrendered. It was not necessary for it to surrender. It advised the surrender; it yielded to being held up by the profiteers—in the first instance by the manufacturing profiteers, and then it yielded to the profiteers from the labor basis, and between the two the poor old Government was ground.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota further yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. STANLEY. If the high wages paid recently were the result of the fiat of law, why not get away from all this trouble by simply passing another law and setting a high-wage scale? If we did it then we can do it now. If it was the result of law and not supply and demand, there is the same force behind the law now that there was then. If supply and demand have nothing to do with it, we can remedy the evil by an act of Congress.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, did supply and demand fix the price of wheat, or did the Government fix it? The Government was able to get around the law of supply and demand whenever it came to what the farmer produced. Wheat would have been at least \$5 a bushel during the war, but the Government stepped in and said that it should not be above \$2.21. It allowed everything that the farmer buys to increase from two to ten times, but it held the farmer down with the strong arm of Government and compelled him to produce, with labor that cost him from \$6 to \$10 a day, a bushel of wheat for \$2.21 at the terminals, and very much less than that upon the farm.

Oh, Mr. President, the same Government that sent the boys into the trenches and into the fire of hell for \$30 a month and compelled them to go there, the same Government that fixed the price of a barrel of flour and a bushel of wheat, had the power to fix the prices of commodities, and, above all, it had the power, when it was paying \$6 and \$8 and \$10 a day, to say to every man, "Give the Government in this day of dire distress an honest day's work." It did not do it. It did not try to do it.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota further yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. STANLEY. If the Government had not touched the price of wheat, I understand the Senator to say that it would have gone to \$5 a bushel.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STANLEY. What would have caused it to reach that dizzy height?

Mr. McCUMBER. The law of supply and demand. All the countries of the world were jumping over each other to get the grain. They needed it. Those foreign countries paid for munitions probably ten times what they cost. They had to have food for their soldiers, as well as munitions.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand the Senator, then, the law of supply and demand during the war operated on wheat, or would have operated on it if it could—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just the same as on other things.

Mr. STANLEY. But it did not operate on wages. I thought the Senator said the Government raised the wages.

Mr. McCUMBER. I said the Government yielded to every strike where ships were being produced for the support of the Government and where munitions were being produced for the support of the Government.

The Government yielded to every demand, no matter whether there was justification or not. A strike would be inaugurated one day, and immediately after the administration granted the

increase demanded the same people would strike the next day, and the price would be raised and raised and raised again; and, as I say, just as prices went up efficiency went down.

During the war, when we were needing ships and needing them badly, when the peril of the U-boat threatened to destroy our cause and the cause of our Allies, I brought to the attention of the Senate the case of a gang of riveters who had been paid by the piece before the war and had averaged 400 rivets a day. The piecework system was discontinued, and they were paid nearly \$14 a day each, and immediately the production of each gang dropped to an average of 51 rivets a day, or only one-eighth of what had been previously accomplished, and the average in the United States was only forty-odd per cent of the prewar average. The Government did not have to submit to that situation, and it would not have submitted to it if the farmer had said, "I demand \$5 a bushel for my wheat."

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I heartily sympathize with the distress of the farmer and with all the Senator has so eloquently said concerning his necessities. But my sympathies are broader than that, and I do not believe the high cost of living or high wages are all due to extortion and disloyalty and unwarranted strikes by every man who was not working on a farm at the time of the country's greatest peril. I believe the man with the hoe and the man behind the hammer, the man behind the plow, and the man behind the plane, that labor everywhere, loyal and true, did magnificently during that war, and in its patience and its love of the flag rivaled the gallantry of the boys in the trenches.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the boys in the trenches are now demanding a bonus to equalize the enormous wages paid to the men who were working here. I say the amounts paid were entirely out of proportion to the services rendered. Heaven knows we want good prices for labor; then we want an honest day's work done. We did not get it, as a rule, during the war. There is no use of anyone saying we did, because you can not deny the overwhelming testimony found in the records of all of the investigations. Why was it? I am not blaming those employed in production and construction so much as I am blaming the Government for its abominable system of cost plus, under which it gave a premium to idleness and a premium for padding the rolls; and they were padded and a premium was paid contractors for idleness.

Go through the record of any of the projects for war purposes and you will find the same condition practically everywhere. Let us be honest with each other, both as to the laboring man and as to the capitalist. The administration said to the capitalist, "You pay for your material anything that is demanded; you pay for labor anything that is demanded, and then we will pay you a bonus of 10 per cent upon the cost of anything you turn over to the Government." In other words, "The more you make it cost the Government, the more you get out of it." And they made it cost the Government an enormous amount.

I charge it to the Government's inefficiency. You may place the blame where you will. The result is exactly the same; the poor old United States was bled white, and we will have to levy taxes to the very limit for the next 25 or 50 years to pay for the wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4746.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who made the pending motion, was forced to leave the Chamber to go to the Judiciary Committee. That motion was made at 2 o'clock, about two hours ago, and all of the intervening time, except about two or three minutes, has been occupied by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], one of the proponents of the so-called emergency tariff bill, who is now criticizing those who are opposed to this legislation.

I do not know why he should blame those who do not agree with him in the effort to increase the cost of living in this country for occupying some time in a discussion of this matter, and also in the discussion of other pieces of legislation which are called up in the Senate. If there could be statistics made of the time that has been consumed by those who are in favor of this so-called emergency tariff legislation and those who are opposed to it, since the bill was reported from the Finance Committee, I think they would show that the proponents of the emergency tariff legislation have consumed more time of the Senate than those who oppose it. They discussed fully those measures; and the so-called emergency tariff bill, which proposes to place additional burdens upon the consuming masses, has not been discussed by a single proponent of the legislation

until to-day, and that was in the two-hour speech of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The packer bill, which was passed yesterday, was legitimately debated for some hours and some days, I might say. It was an important piece of legislation. Those who believed in it, who helped to frame it, who advocated it upon the floor of the Senate, believed, and justly so, that the five big packers had reached that stage in their life where they controlled such a large percentage of certain products in the live-stock business, and in other industries, that it had become such a giant in strength it should be restricted now before it should give a death blow in its further dealings.

I have no fault to find with those who voted against the packer legislation. If there ever was a piece of legislation which came upon the floor of the Senate about which there might be an honest difference of opinion, it was that legislation. I know how the sympathies and the views of men have been formed against commissions because of their regulatory requirements and the manner in which they have conducted various functions of the Government during the last few years. I am of the opinion that those Senators who saw fit in practically every instance to vote against the so-called packer legislation on yesterday did it not because they did not believe that the five big packers should be controlled and should be regulated and should be restricted further, but because of the provisions in the bill touching the commission. But those who believed in that legislation believed in it because they saw the dangers which lurked in the fact that five concerns controlled practically 60 per cent of the leather in the United States—and I may be wrong as to my figures, but they were quite large, as I recall; controlled between 60 and 70 per cent of all the live stock that is butchered which enters into interstate commerce in the United States; controlled a very large percentage of the eggs and poultry and cheese and mutton, those things which go upon the breakfast tables in this country. They thought the packers should be regulated, and that such regulation might in a way reduce the high cost of living, against which orators used their eloquence and inveighed during the last campaign.

After listening to the speech of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota a few moments ago, when he talked about the laboring man getting such high wages, and how he desired to see flour lifted a little bit in price, and wheat raised higher, and wages lowered, I was not surprised when I recalled that on yesterday a good part of the time of the debate was consumed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who now finds fault with some of us opposing this bill and expressing our opposition for a few moments upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we were under the five-minute rule when I spoke yesterday; consequently I could not speak over five minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. It seemed to me quite a long time.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that was a good deal of the time, I do not know how the Senator makes his computation.

Mr. HARRISON. I was just mistaken. It seemed to me quite a long time. Take the other piece of legislation which has been debated here for a week, the minimum wage bill, which is fathered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], a most worthy measure, legitimately debated upon the floor of the Senate.

If the Government of the United States can not fix a minimum wage for its employees, how can we expect the gigantic corporations of the country, which employ men by the thousands and tens of thousands, to have a minimum wage fixed for them? Yet, because some of us think that that is an important piece of legislation, that it should be discussed fully upon the floor of the Senate, though much of the time spent in the debate be taken up by the proponents of this so-called emergency tariff legislation, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota finds fault.

So there are many pieces of legislation now upon the calendar of the Senate which should be taken up for consideration, which need to be debated. There is the measure which was pending during the morning hour, championed by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I have such faith in his good judgment, I have such respect for his splendid patriotism, I like the man so much as a man, and am willing to follow him in so many things, especially when it comes down to dealing with the landlords and tenants of the District of Columbia, that I know it must be a good piece of legislation; and may I say to the Senate that a Senator here feels that he can take time away from the consideration of questions touching his own constituents and his own State and deal with questions of moment and of interest to the District of Columbia.

When I see the name of the distinguished Senator from Idaho attached to that piece of legislation and realize the many great

complicated questions, in the study and solution of which his time is taken up, I know that the Senate should give some of its time to the consideration of that bill. I say that notwithstanding the fact that we recently gave so much attention to a bill proposing disarmament, that received the sanction of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and when it was placed on the calendar I read in the papers that a distinguished ex-Secretary of State, a former United States Senator, asked that it be put off and not considered until the new President takes his seat and can confer with this great ex-Secretary of State upon the proposed legislation.

To the distinguished Senator from North Dakota with reference to this piece of legislation, of which he is such an advocate, and which he says is of so much interest to the wheat growers along the Canadian border, and which he does not say, but which I say, is of so much interest to the five great packers, and which he does not say, but which I say, is of so much interest to the consumers of the country, who have been burdened with the high cost of living for some time to such an extent that they can hardly make ends meet, I would suggest that it might be well, especially in view of the promise made by the Republican Party in the recent campaign touching the high cost of living, to postpone its consideration and give the new President an opportunity to confer with the ex-Secretary of State upon the future policy with reference to the subject matter of that bill.

I have read the Republican campaign textbook of 1910. Some Senators who have been here a long, long time were here then and will remember that that campaign was fought out upon the proposition of the high cost of living. The Democrats charged the Republican Party with the increased or high cost of living, and they defended it and said that the high protective tariff had nothing to do with it. On the floor of the Senate and from every stump in the country Republican spellbinders tried to free themselves of responsibility in connection with the high cost of living in 1910. In that campaign a textbook was issued, from which I might read paragraph after paragraph in which the Republican Party said that the increased price of foodstuffs could not be laid at the door of the protective tariff which they had placed upon the statute books. I shall read, before the debate is concluded, a report signed by certain Senators, members of a committee appointed by the then Vice President, upon a resolution which was presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I think, asking for an investigation into the high cost of living. On that committee the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] sat, and he, with the Senator from Massachusetts and others, signed the report. I wish to read just one paragraph from the report. The Senator from North Dakota will remember it. Here is what the Senator and other Republican Senators said in that report to the Senate of the United States:

The tariff seems to have been no material factor in causing the advance in prices during the past decade. The greatest advances have been made in commodities upon which the tariff has little or no effect, and the absolute removal of the tariff on many of these commodities could not have afforded relief at the present time, for the reason that the prices of these commodities, with a few exceptions, were as high or higher in other countries than in the United States.

So when it suits the Senator from North Dakota and suits his party in a campaign when they are charged with the responsibility for the high cost of living, and it is placed at their doors because of a high protective tariff, they say the tariff had nothing to do with it. In my humble opinion, the tariff of 40 cents a bushel on wheat, as provided in the pending bill, will have nothing to do with the price of wheat, for the very reason that was stated by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

It has been stated by Republican Senators in Congress and Republican leaders for generations that where there is produced in the country a surplus of exports over imports, as in this case, the tariff does not affect the price. It is a sham; it is a pretense. The price of wheat, in my humble opinion, is fixed in Liverpool, England.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator from Mississippi fails to catch the double purpose of the Senator from North Dakota. He proposes, as I understand, first to raise the price of wheat 40 cents a bushel by the imposition of a tariff, and, secondly, to prevent the importation of Canadian wheat into this country, notwithstanding the fact that wheat here after the bill is passed will bring about 65 cents more per bushel than wheat does in Canada. It is a double purpose that the Senator is going to subserve.

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely. Of course, it is a sham and a pretense. It is the most specious piece of political hypocrisy ever presented to the United States Senate. It is merely for the purpose of fooling some farmers out West into the belief that they will get more for their wheat in the event the proposition goes through. But if they could get more for their wheat we can not get away from the proposition that somebody pays the bill, and who is it that pays the bill if it is not the consumers of the country, the people who eat bread?

Mr. STANLEY. I understand the principal reason, or one of the reasons given, for the imposition of the tariff is to prevent the importation of Canadian wheat. If the imposition of the duty raises the price of American wheat, I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi how that is going to stop the flow of Canadian importation?

Mr. HARRISON. It can not do it.

A man with whom I served in the House, a very distinguished Republican who lives not far from the Canadian border, made a speech April 18, 1911, touching the question of a tariff on farm products. I desire to read an extract from that speech:

Again we find the inspired by cash and patriotism journals and oracles contending that we are discriminating against the American farmer because we cut the Payne tariff rate on wheat from 25 cents per bushel to 12 cents. My answer to this charge is that the 25-cent rate nor the 15-cent rate has not in the past and will not in the future have anything whatever to do with the price of wheat in this country or in Canada. There is not a country in this world that can compete with us in the raising of wheat anyway, and the tariff has been but an idle recital on the statute book, without affording the farmer one grain of protection in sheaf, at the granary, the elevator, or the mill. It is charged that wheat is 10 cents higher on our side than on the Canadian side. That is true partially. Both crops are controlled largely, if not absolutely, by the price at Liverpool, and in some cases from local conditions, usually transportation facilities, there are variances of 10 or more cents per bushel. It is, however, true that wheat in Winnipeg is higher than in the States for more than one-third of the year. I submit the prices of wheat often vary this much within a single State, and the figures do not prove that generally such is the case, and the safe prediction to make is that, the conditions being practically the same, the price of the land and labor being practically the same, both crops being controlled by the Liverpool market, the prices are not essentially different. This, of course, is not a universal rule, for local conditions vary the prices; also corners or hoarding oftentimes are causes for wheat going up or down suddenly.

To the end that we may not be mistaken about the matter, let us consult the statistics to ascertain just how much wheat we sent to Canada last year. In 1910 we sent to Canada to get the benefit of the outrageously low price referred to by those opposing this pact 2,111,370 bushels of wheat; and how interesting it is to observe that only 135,441 bushels of wheat came from Canada to get the benefit of our high prices, asserted to be caused by our tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel. The charge of the high-protection advocate will answer itself when these figures are analyzed. How refreshing it must be to the American farmer to know that he is no longer to be the cat's-paw that is to shield the greedy manufacturer while he grows rich from legislation and pleads for the farmer to stand by him because there has appeared on the statute book an idle recital of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. Such a proceeding is merely the selling to the farmers razors that will not shave. It is merely deceiving to get the farmer's help to further deceive the poor consumer of this country, who has hunger gnawing at his very stomach and whose poor cupboard is bare.

Those were the utterances of the distinguished Republican Congressman who lives along the border. I could read from other distinguished Republicans whose remarks I have here, but I shall not take up the time of the Senate this afternoon. I might be charged with filibustering if I should do so, and yet I have occupied less time since the bill was introduced than perhaps any Senator on the floor. So I pass from that, believing that the farmers have been fooled too much and too long, that the bill will not help them a particle, and where if we should help one of them we would hurt 199 consumers in the country.

I do not mind Republican Senators fooling the farmers in their respective localities, but I do not very much relish their coming over into our precincts and trying to fool some of our farmers. The Republicans have gone down into my State and for the first time are trying to hoodwink the cotton farmer there. It is smart; it is an adroit piece of work; but I lift up my voice against it. I do not want the farmers in my section of the country—the cotton farmers or any other farmers—to ever get it into their heads that a tariff upon wheat or upon cotton or upon any other similar product will ever help them, for I know that it will not. If it should I am that much against the principle of levying tribute against many in order to help a few that I would still continue to oppose it.

The pending bill is either intended to place a greater burden upon the consumer or to levy tariff taxes in order to protect the farmer. If an extension of tariff taxes will help the farmers, just that much will it hurt those who must necessarily buy from the farmers.

Before I proceed to analyze the bill I desire to say that I hold in my hand the Republican campaign textbook for 1920, about half of which is taken up by a discussion of the high cost

of living, criticizing the present administration for the high cost of living, and stating that the Republicans propose to remedy it when they get in. The other half of that textbook is composed of unwarranted, inexcusable, unjustifiable criticisms of the administration; but as the days pass by and the sunlight of truth shines forth the people will see the hypocrisy of the Republican pretensions. You promised them that you were going to reduce prices, and yet the bill now receiving the attention of the Senate and which Senators on the other side are clamoring to press down our throats and down the throats of the American people is one that is intended either to fool and deceive the farmers or to add to the high cost of living in this country.

Here [exhibiting] is a campaign document issued by the speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee during the campaign. It is labeled "Speakers' Series No. 1." It was put at the head of all the rest; it was made the most important document that should be issued in the form of a campaign pamphlet and it was headed "The High Cost of Living." It was not printed in small type, either; it was so printed as to be attractive, so that when as it was passed around by your campaign messengers people would ask, "What is it?" The reply would be, "It is a document on 'The High Cost of Living.'" The Republican Party in that pamphlet states it is going to remove some of the burdens of taxation and prevent the extortion incident to the high cost of living which the Democratic Party is responsible for having perpetrated on the people. Read it; it will be interesting." Of course the little housewife and her husband are interested. They are living or trying to live on small wages and striving to make ends meet, taking the pay check and going down on Saturday night and seeing the proceeds eaten up before they have half of the commodities which they need for the coming week. So that pamphlet was attractive to them; they called for it. I have no doubt that the speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee had to have a reprint and yet another reprint of this pamphlet called "The High Cost of Living." I shall not read it; it may be necessary before the debate is over to do so; but for the present I shall merely call it to the attention of Senators. No doubt the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] saw it, although it may be that out of courtesy to his constituents, who are clamoring for a higher tariff on foodstuffs, the campaign committee kept it out of his State; but it went from one end of the country to the other.

That was not the only pamphlet which Republicans issued touching the high cost of commodities. The speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee issued pamphlet No. 3 in most attractive form, with the title printed in larger letters than in the case of the "High Cost of Living" pamphlet and with a big question mark under the title. I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota saw the pamphlet. I have not the slightest doubt that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the economist of the Senate, he who sometimes exercises the power of his office to keep down the expenses of the Government by refusing Senators the privilege of placing speeches or pamphlets or documents into the Record—I doubt not that he gave no evidence of a desire of economy on the part of the Republican Party in making demand after demand in his recent campaign in Utah that he sent thousands on thousands of copies of the pamphlet entitled, "Why 25 Cent Sugar?" It may be that because of the distribution in Utah and in other States of the Union of the pamphlet, "Why 25 Cent Sugar," and the pamphlet entitled, "The High Cost of Living," the Republican Party were enabled to get such large majorities in the recent election.

However, what I am contending is that the Republicans should not fool their constituents so soon after the election.

If you have led them to believe by speeches and pamphlets and propaganda that the Democratic Party had placed a heavy burden upon their backs and was responsible for the high cost of living, then you ought to meet your promises; you ought to redeem your pledges. If you are not going to do that, you should not begin at such an early day throwing those promises and pledges to the winds and disregarding them, as you are doing in the bill now pending before the Senate. You promised to reduce the cost of living, and yet in this bill here is the way you propose to do it: You start off with cherries; you do not want the people even to have cherries, although I know they do not now need cherries for some purposes for which they formerly used them. Apples! You do not want any apples imported into this country. Then we come down to the hides of cattle and find that you desire to prevent hides coming in. Why, Mr. President, Senators who are proposing this legislation evidently are not the fathers of families; evidently they

have not been obliged to visit the stores in the past two or three years and purchase numerous pairs of children's shoes, six or seven pairs a year for each child, costing \$6, \$7, \$8, and sometimes as high as \$12 a pair, for those Senators, who promised the people to reduce the cost of living, would impose a tariff, a tax, on every person in this country who has to buy a pair of shoes.

I asked a retailer some days ago what was the present price of shoes. I have here some of the prices which he quoted. They are the prices to-day, after the retailers have unloaded, after "sales" have been held, and when the stocks on hand are small. Men's shoes, \$7, \$10, \$12, and \$15 a pair. In October the prices were \$10, \$12, and \$18. The October prices are those which the Republicans in the Senate at least, and evidently those in the House, wish to retain and compel all the people in this country to pay. I repeat, in October the prices were \$10, \$12, and \$18, whereas now they have gone down to \$8, \$10, and \$15. That reduction has taken place within a few months; but now it appears the Republicans want to lift the price back, and the best method they can think of to accomplish that result is to pass a piece of legislation which will put a 15 per cent ad valorem duty on the hides of cattle.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. When the Senator asked the retail merchant the price of shoes, did he also ask him how much an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent on leather would add to the price of shoes?

Mr. HARRISON. I did not ask him that.

Mr. McCUMBER. It will add between 4½ and 5 cents.

Mr. HARRISON. Between 4½ and 5 cents on a pair of shoes?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Utah are such experts that I will not take issue with them as to that, because I have not figured it out; I could not figure it out if I wanted to, and I doubt if they have figured it out correctly; but I know that what they now propose to do is to add a further burden on the people who have to buy shoes.

I am not surprised at that, especially when I heard the distinguished Senator from North Dakota a few moments ago, in referring to wheat, say that to place the proposed tariff on wheat would not make the laboring man now receiving a certain wage work over one-fourth of a day longer. That may be true, but a fourth of a day longer for every workingman in this country is a pretty hard burden, and I am not willing with my vote to say that every workingman in this country who eats biscuits and bread and needs flour will have to work a fourth of a day longer in order to pay tribute to a few farmers along the Canadian border.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I know the Senator wants to be accurate. The Senator did not understand me to say a fourth of a day longer every day, but that it would be the equivalent of the earnings of a fourth of one day for one year, which is quite a difference.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, for one year? Well, I am not willing to go even that far with the Senator. I am glad, though, that the Senator has got it down to one-fourth of a day a year now.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator must remember that I was speaking of a barrel of flour a year, which is the average consumption; and it would require, at the present wage of a carpenter, one-fourth of one day's work during a year, provided it was all tacked to the barrel of flour.

Mr. HARRISON. So we are agreed, by admission from the Senators from Utah and North Dakota, that on every pair of shoes it will increase the price 4½ or 5½ cents, and that it will make the wage earner work a fourth of a day a year longer.

Let us go down the line. You have tobacco here. You want to stop the poor old fellow from smoking and chewing. I knew there were some fanatics in the country who were trying to start that propaganda, but I did not know that the Senators from Utah and North Dakota were giving impetus to that movement.

I go down the list.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if the Senator wants the genesis of any of these items in the bill on tobacco and hides, I think he will have to go to his own side of the Chamber.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought before this debate was over that the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators on that side would want to excuse themselves from the responsibility.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am not excusing myself. I think the Senator who wanted the addition made on hides was the

Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. I think he offered that particular amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator voted for it.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the increases on tobacco were made as the result of petitions from the localities where tobacco is raised, and it is raised both north and south of the line. We saw the good reasons for it, and therefore we adopted their rates.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not able to say, because I do not recollect, who proposed the provision in the bill relating to hides; but I do know, Mr. President, that so far as the action of the committee was concerned, the duty laid upon tobacco in this bill came as the result of a suggestion from the Senator from Connecticut. It applies only to the particular kind of tobacco which is raised in Connecticut. If there is any tobacco in this country that is covered by the provisions of the bill outside of that grown in Connecticut, I do not know of it. At least, so far as the Finance Committee's consideration of this matter is concerned, it was confined to a discussion of the requirements and demands of the tobacco growers in Connecticut, where they grow under cover a tobacco suited almost entirely and used almost entirely for wrappers. It was suggested that this tobacco needed an enormous increase in the tariff already upon it, the tariff on it already being about \$2.85 a pound, as I recall, and it was suggested that that duty ought to be increased an additional dollar a pound. Nobody representing the great tobacco interests of this country, especially of the South, suggested that the tobacco grown in that section needed any protection, or that any amount of duty imposed upon tobacco of that character would in the slightest degree affect the domestic market price of that tobacco.

Tobacco is grown chiefly in the South. More than half of all the tobacco of this country is grown in the South, and I have never yet met a southern man who believed that a tariff upon tobacco would be worth one cent to him. I have never heard of their coming to Congress and asking for the imposition of any duty upon the character of tobacco which they grow. So the suggestion that the request for the duty imposed upon tobacco in this bill came from this side of the Chamber, so far as my knowledge goes, is without the slightest foundation whatever.

Mr. HARRISON. We have got it down now to a point where neither side wants to be responsible for certain items in this bill. I am glad this side is not responsible for them, and this side will not be responsible for the passage of the bill should it pass; but it is rather unfair to say that we are unnecessarily debating a piece of legislation of this importance, because during all the time it has been before the Senate there has not yet been four hours—there has not been two hours and a half—of discussion of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think it perfectly fair to the Senator and to those on this side of the Chamber to say that we expect that all the time that is necessary for a proper discussion of this measure will be granted, and granted cheerfully, and will be taken in the same cheerful manner. I do not think I stated anything to-day about any filibuster. I did believe that Senators should try to dispose of the subject as soon as they had given it full and fair consideration. I have asked no more. But when the Senator from Mississippi some time ago introduced an amendment consisting of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which if we read from early morning until late at night during the entire session we would not have read half-way through, I know the Senator will excuse me if I thought there was in that amendment a mild suggestion of a proposed filibuster; and I gathered the idea, just a little, that possibly the Senator wanted to consume time. Otherwise, I could not see any use of introducing an amendment to this bill the Revised Statutes of the United States, which would require about three months, I think, merely to read in the ordinary number of hours. I know now, however, that the Senator does not intend anything of that kind, and does not seriously propose to have read the Revised Statutes of the United States; so let us both forget any suggestion or intimation or suspicion that there is any filibuster, and let us try to get through with this bill as soon as we can.

Mr. HARRISON. Let us never hear the word "filibuster" again.

I am glad that the Senator has brought up some of the amendments I have offered to this bill. I think if there is an important matter that is pending before the Senate it is the codification of the laws of the United States. I recall, I think in the Sixty-third Congress, when after working for weeks and weeks and weeks in the House we finally brought out a bill there, and then it came to the Senate, and it died. That bill was brought out by a distinguished Republican Member of the House, Congressman LITTLE, of Kansas, who has given great and earnest and continued thought to the codification of the laws of the United States. It was passed in the House and is pending over here in the Senate, and if the Senate can get to it before the 4th of March, it is a piece of legislation that should be passed, and I thought this would be one of the best ways to pass that legislation.

The Senator forgets, too, that I offered two or three other amendments. I am sorry that the Finance Committee, which is controlled by the Senator's party, did not tack those amendments on to this bill. It is legislation that is worthy, it is just, it commends itself to very patriotic and wise Senator here.

No one could find fault with those amendments. In one of them I wanted really to do something that would be worth while for the farmers of the country, since the farm-loan bank system can not operate because of this case that is pending in the Supreme Court. I might say in passing that I hope, and sincerely hope, and I know I voice the wish of every Senator and every man who is interested in the farm-loan bank system, that a decision will be forthcoming very soon on that important piece of legislation, whether it is favorable to it or against it, so that we can do something toward it. I offered a very short amendment with the idea and in the hope that we might do something for the farmers who are caught in these abnormal times, in the stress of the present-day conditions, with prices declining in some instances; that we might create some medium whereby they might borrow money for short terms—six months—secured by agricultural products, wheat elevator receipts or cotton-warehouse receipts. It was in the hope that we could do something for these men who really need some money now that I offered that amendment; but I find that it received no sympathy upon the part of the Republican majority of the Senate. They turned me down in that effort really to do something for these farmers.

Another amendment that I proposed was to do something for the western people in the way of irrigation, and the other was to do something for the soldiers. There was passed through the House some eight months ago a soldiers' bonus bill. Since that time it has been before the Finance Committee of the Senate, controlled by the Senators with whom I have been debating this question. I wanted to get it out of that committee; but the Republican majority of the Finance Committee turned me down on that amendment. I proposed the bill which was passed by the House and sent to the Senate as an amendment to this legislation to do something for these soldiers, and yet I find myself criticized for doing that.

We are almost together. We both agree now that there is no filibustering about this proposition; that the bill is of such moment that it should be debated fully; and I hope it will be. I do not want to see the big appropriation bills killed. Nearly two months of this session have passed and only about 35 days remain before the session will close. So far we have passed only one of the great supply bills. The first thing we know the calendar will be clogged and we will not be able to give those bills the degree of consideration they warrant and deserve. So, while I am in hopes that we can fully discuss this bill, I fear very much, because of the state of the calendar and the importance of those bills, that we shall not get as much time to discuss this bill as it deserves.

But we will have to work together about it. We will have to cooperate with one another and do the very best we can under the circumstances.

Is the Senate to recess or adjourn this afternoon? The Senator from Montana, who made the motion now before the Senate, is not in the Chamber.

Mr. McCUMBER. The usual time for adjournment is about 5 o'clock, and I would like to have the Senate go on for another 15 minutes. But the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who wishes to be present during the debate, said he would like to have the Senate adjourn at 10 minutes before 5 to-day on account of work he has to do, and if the Senator from Mississippi does not wish to speak any longer now we might as well adjourn at this time. It would be a difference of only five minutes, anyway.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well.

SIZE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before we adjourn I desire to put in the RECORD the figures as to the present strength and expenditures on account of the armies of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany, as given me by the librarian.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table showing the relative size of the military establishments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany, and the expenditures with regard to same.

[Data compiled from Statesman's Year Book, 1919, 1920; World Almanac, 1921; New York Herald, Oct. 3, 1920, p. 17; Current History, December, 1920, pp. 373-379; National Service, August, 1920, p. 124; London Economist, Mar. 20, 1920, p. 643.]

Country.	Present strength.	Expenditures, 1919-20.	Estimated expenditure, 1920-21.
Great Britain.....	348,000	\$500,000,000	\$125,000,000
France.....	378,000	2,735,000,000	1,700,000,000
Italy.....	250,000	391,503,923
Japan.....	600,000	\$205,000,000	\$200,000,000
Germany.....	100,000	1,500,000,000

¹ Francs.

² Lira.

³ Marks.

UNITED STATES FORCES IN GERMANY.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I also desire to make a statement in reference to the testimony of the Secretary of War a few days ago before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate as to the amount of the cost of our forces in Germany. The total cost of our forces in Germany up to date is the sum of \$263,628,320. Up to September 30, 1920, Germany had paid \$35,573,658, leaving a balance due the United States of \$228,054,662. The average cost to Germany, when she pays it, will be \$71,218 per day.

I put these figures in the RECORD for the purpose of calling attention to them, and especially to call attention to the very large amount which Germany apparently still owes us.

There was a good deal of doubt in the testimony which was adduced before our committee, and I have the figures up to September 30, 1920. Since that time an examination has been made, but up to date we have found no subsequent payments. If there have been any payments I will later give the amounts of such payments. At all events, the very stupendous sum of \$228,000,000 is due us by Germany to-day, and, so far as I know, no efforts are being made to procure the payment. I ask unanimous consent to put these figures in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total cost of United States forces in Germany up to Sept. 30, 1920.....	\$263, 628, 320
Amount paid United States by Germany up to Sept. 30, 1920.....	35, 573, 658
Leaving a balance due United States of.....	228, 054, 662
The average strength of the Army was—	
Officers.....	711
Enlisted men.....	14, 547
Total.....	15, 258
Average cost to Germany per day, \$71,218.	

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 26, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TILSON).

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, pastor of Calvary Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God accept our gratitude for every expression of Divine care manifested toward our beloved country. May Thy truth flood all of our hearts and nourish therein the roots of every good thing, that our purposes may be high, our vows noble, and all of our desires reaching out toward Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.